DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 319 289 HE 023 449

TITLE	Postsecondary Education Seminars Conference (12th, Airlie, Virginia, June 1-3, 1976). Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Mariscal and Co., Los Angeles, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	National Center for Education Statistics (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jun 76
NOTE	142p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Data Collection; *Educational Research; Higher Education; *Information Needs; Policy Formation; *Postsecondary Education; *Research Design; *Surveys; Workshops

ABSTRACT

The postsecondary seminars report presents the distillation of the discussions and the recommendations of approximately 115 representatives of educational institutions, associations, and State and Federal agencies attending the Postsecondary Education Seminars Conference of 1976. The conference addressed the changing nature of postsecondary education and its implications with respect to the mandate and program of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). The report begins with general meeting presentation, including opening remarks by Marie D. Eldridge, a panel discussion on reducing the survey burden, and addresses by the Reverand Jesse Jackson, Cleveland L. Dennard and Caroline Bird. Following this, the report offers summaries of six seminars, including topics discussed and the recommendations developed, and provides a list of each seminar's participants. Some commonly held opinions from the conference were: (1) there exists a serious lack of standard and compatible definitions and terminology across the spectrum of postsecondary education; (2) the study's focus should be on the student, not the institution; (3) NCES should reimburse, either partially or fully, survey respondents for data provided; (4) NCES should use a "quick survey" technique to rapidly identify changing patterns; (5) data should be made relevant to educational data collected by other federal agencies; and (6) NCES should investigate databases now available to determine if they are sufficient. Appendices include a list of seminar participants, the agenda, the conference evaluation questionnaire form and analysis Education General Information Survey and other postsecondary surveys. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FINAL REPORT

of

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION SEMINARS OF 1976

Conducted by:

MARISCAL AND COMPANY

Under Contract With:

NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS
Assistant Secretary for Education
U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare

June 1-3, 1976
Airlie Foundation
Airlie, Virginia

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. GENERAL MEETING PRESENTATIONS

Opening Remarks 2

The Postsecondary Education Conference of 1976 6

Reducing the Survey Burden 8

Postsecondary Education and Issues in Social Mobility 14

Postsecondary Education Revisited 20

The Case Against College 38

III. GROUP SEMINAR REPORTS

GROUP I 49

"Looking Toward a Single Survey for Collegiate and Noncollegiate Postsecondary Institutions; Assessing the Similarities and Differences in Data and Definitions"

GROUP II 53

"The Survey Reduction Program: The Federal Reports Act; Attachment A to OMB Circular A-40; and Guidelines for Reducing Public Reporting to Federal Agencies"

GROUP III 63

"The Issues of Student Access, Choice, and Retention"

GROUP IV 72

"The Issues and Future of Planning and Coordinating Postsecondary Programs at the State Level"

GROUP V 75

"The Development and Consolidation of Programs of Assistance to the States and the Structure and Mechanism for the Consolidated Priorities"

GROUP VI 81

"Postsecondary Issues and Concerns for 1985 and Related Data Needs"

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

Page

IV. SUMMARY 91

APPENDICES

A. Seminar Participants A-1

B. Agenda B-1

C. Conference Evaluation Form and Analysis of Questionnaire Responses C-1

D. Description of HEGIS and other Postsecondary Surveys D-1

I. INTRODUCTION

The 1976 Postsecondary Education Conference was conducted by Mariscal and Company under contract with the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) at the Airlie Foundation in Airlie, Virginia, on June 1-3, 1976.

Marie D. Eldridge, Administrator of NCES, officially welcomed the participants, and opened the conference by talking about the emerging "new look" for NCES. Mr. Theodore H. Drews, Acting Director, Division of Survey Planning and Analysis, NCES, acting as Conference Chairman went on to set the theme and outline the objectives of the Conference.

This was the twelfth in a series of Conferences, of which the prior eleven focused specifically on eliciting advice and comment from experienced members of the educational community on the content and format of the Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS). The current Conference, however, was much broader in scope and addressed itself to the changing nature of "postsecondary" education in its broadest terms and the implications of these changes with respect to the mandate and program of NCES.

This report presents the distillation of the discussions and the recommendations of approximately 115 representatives of educational institutions, associations, and State and Federal agencies who attended the Conference and participated in its seminar meetings and plenary sessions.

II. GENERAL MEETING PRESENTATIONS

OPENING REMARKS

By: Marie D. Eldridge
Administrator, NCES

It is a privilege indeed to be able to welcome you to the Postsecondary Education Seminars of 1976. I have had the good fortune to meet many of you already and this Conference is a good chance to get to know you all a little better. And I would like to say at the outset that it is good for my morale to know that so many of you, with so many demands already made of you, are willing to spend the next few days with us to achieve our mutual and very worthwhile objectives of collecting and disseminating relevant data on the educational process.

The "new look" for the National Center for Education Statistics is still emerging. Current legislation pending in the Congress can be expected to have a major impact on our future profile. The planners and operating agencies within HEW exert influence on our future directions. And, of course, it has been a longstanding tradition within the Center to solicit and respond, to the extent possible, to needs and ideas generated by the education community at large.

It has been said that the length of time in weeks required for the acceptance and internalization of a new idea in a government bureaucracy varies as $T = 2+2(n-3)^2$ where n is the number of individuals and discrete organizational elements involved in agreeing upon the fact and form of the idea and required for adoption. A quick calculation, if one believes this formula, for a decision involving 30 people, would indicate almost 30 years is required.

In fact, if n = 0, 20 weeks are required. I can't help but think that this is a reflection of the fact that the bureaucracy will fan even a bad idea for five months before it finally gives up and allows it to succumb. I could go on with other iterations of the formula but I prefer to leave those for your enlightenment and amusement. This thought was originally reviewed in the Public Administration Review in the Spring of 1969 by a friend of mine, Ron Lee, who at the time was at Michigan State University.

Now - you may wonder why I chose this subject as my thought for this evening. There are a number of reasons. First, this is our initial postsecondary conference. It may be our last - but it may also be the first of a new approach to treating the educational process, about which we are collecting data, as a continuous process from the cradle to the grave. Just as we see the distinctions between collegiate and noncollegiate postsecondary education falling by the wayside, I believe the natural extension to a merger of secondary and postsecondary may well be waiting in the wings for the right cast of characters.

Second - the Presidential directive to reduce the number of government forms and the heavy burden they place on individuals, employers, and State and local governments, has mandated that serious reviews of the status quo be undertaken and that somehow we respond to new thrusts along with the maintenance of the necessary historical series in a less painful mode. Obviously, a new non-bureaucratic methodology must be found to accomplish this goal.

Thirdly - I am firmly committed to an interactive process both within and outside government. The formula I cited would argue for autonomy - but I reject that both professionally and personally. While I believe that a system must evolve out of a give and take of ideas in the work process rather than from a blue print drafted in advance, our responsibilities are clear. The task we face, in light of this mathematically simple law, is to perfect systems and procedures so that reduction coefficients can be applied to the equation as a whole. This Conference can be thought of as an experiment to accomplish that. To quote an old cliché, if you are to be part of the landing you must be part of the take-off as well. In addition to your participation in the individual work groups I strongly recommend that you complete and augment the conference evaluation sheet in light of my thoughts.

Before turning the agenda back to Ted, and I know we are all interested in hearing from our distinguished speaker this evening, I would like to leave only one additional thought. I want to thank each one of you in advance for your participation in this Conference. You are assisting a program which I am very much excited about, and I am not alone in this reaction to a statistical function within the bureaucracy. Wilbur Cohen, after he assumed the position of Secretary of HEW in the late sixties, was quoted as having said that there are others in HEW who do more important work and who have more impact on the Department's programs than the Secretary. One such person, he felt, is the Director of Statistics, a post he once held in the Social Security Administration. He said that the Director and his staff, do more to determine future HEW programs than all other officials in the Department. The statistician asks the questions, gathers the facts and writes the reports which are used to formulate Federal policies and programs. And that's what this Conference is all about. Your input is terribly important to us.

THE POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION CONFERENCE OF 1976

Mr. Theodore H. Drews, the Conference Chairman, opened the first full session of the Conference with a short exposition of the general procedure to be followed by the participants during the Conference. He indicated that Conference members would be subdivided into six smaller working groups, each of which would be given a specific topic related to an issue or concern bearing on the NCES survey program. Each group would spend approximately six hours in intensive discussion of the assigned topic, organize their conclusions into a brief report, and present this report, including their recommendations, to a plenary session of the entire Conference where the opportunity would be provided for comment and group interaction.

In commenting upon the major topic of the opening meeting, "Reducing Survey Burden", Mr. Drews stated that NCES is in the position between the hammer and the anvil -- the "hammer" of data users who demand the acquisition and publication of more and more data, and the "anvil" of respondents who have been saying "enough already". NCES must steer a course in which data are acquired that are needed for policy makers and managers in the postsecondary community but with a due regard for the trauma, trials and tribulations of the respondents who must keep putting numbers in the forms sent out to them. The opening meeting had been designed to insure that all of the small group deliberations would be undertaken with a conscious understanding of the inherent dilemma faced by NCES in responding to both data users and data respondents.

Mr. Drews pointed out that NCES cannot continue to burden the respondents with more and more requirements for data: "We must listen to their complaints and we must be able to assure them that what we do and what we ask represents an absolute minimum requirement. We should be able to demonstrate that the need exists for the data we request and explain the uses to which the data will be put."

The concerns and resistance of survey respondents have increasingly come to the attention of the Office of the President, which in turn has communicated with the Office of Management and Budget and other federal agencies the need for consideration of the utility and burden of statistical questionnaires. To set this stage, Mr. Drews introduced Mr. Thomas McFee, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Management, Planning and Technology, HEW, who has been given the assignment of implementing the new Federal restrictions and constraints on data acquisition for the Department. Joining Mr. McFee on a Panel to discuss this problem were Mr. David Caywood, Office of Management and Budget; Mr. William Goddard, National Association of Trade and Technical Schools; Mr. Dennis Jones, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems; and Mr. Paul Wing, State University of New York.

REDUCING THE SURVEY BURDEN

(Panel Discussion)

Panel Members: Mr. Thomas McFee - Panel Moderator
Mr. David Caywood
Mr. William A. Goddard
Mr. Dennis P. Jones
Mr. Paul Wing

Mr. McFee expressed appreciation for the presence of all the conferees who had gathered together for the purpose of discussing mutual problems. He pointed out that the discussion would serve to illuminate those items that have been a burden, as well as to suggest new ways that the Department and the conferees could work together to solve these problems.

Following are some of Mr. McFee's comments:

The topic "Reducing the Survey Burden" is a timely subject. The key is to reduce the burden of data collection by producing more accurate, more timely, more relevant and better information. Not everyone understands the difference between data and information. In that distinction lies the key to reducing the survey burden. Clearly HEW and other agencies are faced with the dilemma of pressure from one side to cut down on the reporting burden, and pressure from the other side to collect more as well as better data.

There are several things that HEW is involved in and has been doing in recent years that have a direct impact upon the survey burden. We have taken steps over the last few years to reorganize and change the policies and procedures concerning the statistical operation of the Department. These steps were taken in response to a letter from then Director of the Office of Management and Budget, George P. Schultz, in July, 1971. This letter was the outgrowth of the National Statistical Committee's (the ASH Committee's) review of a budget involving $100 million for statistical activity; $30 million in postage; $150 million in salaries involving over 4,000 people, and 30 million hours to fill out forms -- all being a direct result of the request for information from the Department of HEW.

We have set up at least three major statistical centers and possibly a fourth, to focus on the respondent. Our approach has been to try to centralize in and around the respondent area. It is now Department policy to move into these data centers or statistical centers, in depth, and analyze not just statistical operations but program data, management data, and compliance data.

The Privacy Act, in its attempt to verify and validate the information gathering process, requires us to return to a source and collect information over again if the information sought is to be used for a new and different purpose. In addition, respondents have to be notified if the data are required by law. The privacy movement has caused the Federal Government and the education community numerous problems including the problem of information falling into the wrong hands, the problem of validity, and restrictions on First Amendment grounds as to what information can be collected.

Mr. McFee then commented on the need for cooperative State and local information systems to coordinate the collection of data, so that the collection will be done for the mutual benefit of various levels of government.

Mr. McFee called attention to the President's plan for a ten percent reduction in the reporting burden on respondents, and an overall effort to attempt to reduce the burden on the public by reducing the number of forms required.

Mr. McFee commented further:

In addition to the short-range effort of meeting the ten percent goal, we are also working on some long-range solutions toward modifying our internal procedures to insure a lasting impact toward reducing the survey burden. There will be more internal reviews. Further efforts will consist of an attempt to consolidate forms so that there is a single annual reporting form; and more coordination at State and local levels so that special data collection efforts will not be duplicated.

Mr. McFee mentioned that public hearings may be held to discuss some of the above points. Mr. McFee and the other panel members each went on to stress and reinforce the point concerning the need to reduce the survey burden.

Mr. McFee concluded by saying that the statistical reporting system is at least two months behind schedule, but there has been considerable activity and planning going on in that particular area to remedy the situation. Also, he pointed out that HEW is below its quota of survey report production, since the Department expends one-third of the Federal budget but has responsibility for only one-fifth of all Federal reports.

Mr. Caywood (OMB) mentioned that it has become apparent to the President and to all, that there is considerable public reticence in providing the Federal Government and other agencies with information they need to do their job. It boils down to the fact that Federal agencies must make do with less information. Mr. Caywood was confident that it could be done, and under this thoughtful and systematic program that the Department of HEW is embarking on, it will be done successfully.

Mr. Goddard, as the representative of the National Association of Trade and Technical Schools and the private sector in vocational education, said that he spoke from the point of view of the "anvil" group referenced in Mr. Drews opening remarks. He noted that the present survey burden is already much too high, and that there is a need to know the constructive purpose of the data so that when a request is received, the request and its purpose are readily understood. He expressed disappointment at the prospect of public hearings which would not only be time consuming, but costly from the taxpayer's standpoint.

Mr. Jones, Associate Director, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, was negative about using the total number of questionnaires as a criteria for the burden of a survey. How many questionnaires that come in the door is not necessarily an important factor. In measuring the burden in the context of time required to fill out the forms, the problem is the amount of statistics required to complete the form. This more realistic measure of burden becomes important when you look at the other end of the tube, the data provider. Overlap in data requirements is not really obvious to anybody except to the person who must complete the forms. Mr. Jones went on to say that burden is a relative thing and is most obvious at the institutional level. A small questionnaire is burdensome if it has no utility.

Mr. Wing, State University of New York, discussed the roles for HEGIS within NCES. The first role of HEGIS should be developing information standards - standard definitions and standard categories. Secondly, HEGIS serves as an information core and an information base; and thirdly, HEGIS provides incentives and guidance to states for setting up their own information systems. There is a need for cooperative and continued efforts between the Federal

Government, the States, and institutions in setting up information bases.

The focus should not be on the need to collect data, but to use it and use it effectively. He talked about several things that should be considered in establishing a better balance between resource spending on collecting data and resource spending on analyzing and using the data for policy making and planning. First, if data are not used on a regular basis, they should be dropped from any survey, and secondly, the level of the detail elicited by the survey instrument should correspond with the detail needed to deal with the issues the Government is inquiring about.

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION AND ISSUES IN SOCIAL MOBILITY

By: Rev. Jesse Jackson

NOTE: Reverend Jackson's address was not made available to the Conference in hard copy form. The following summary of his presentation is the result of dictation taken at the time of his address.

Reverend Jackson looked over the audience composed of representatives to the Conference on Postsecondary Education and wondered how and where he might fit in, being "only a country preacher." He said he felt that he was at a "crossroads", because ten years ago, he was at Airlie House with Dr. Martin Luther King. He said that ten years ago, when he was 24, he thought he knew everything; now he realized he knows nothing, and considered this change in attitude to be a mark of his own progress.

He compared the Conference to a "crossroads", where the social activists, the community type, the planner, the educator, and statistician meet. He felt that there is a general collapse in the public schools around the country -- that something spiritual is missing. He pointed out that our students must once again feel the urge to learn and excel. This has been lost. Ethical standards have been forgotten, and "the death of ethics is the sabotage of excellence."

He mentioned a situation in the inner city schools where the students were described as high on dope. Someone commented that "they weren't harming anybody but themselves." He thought that this remark revealed a poor insight into a tragic situation, and spoke of this as "a commentary on our times," reflecting the laxity in morals and ethics that has developed in the inner city schools."

He felt that many people, especially black people, are trapped in a city. They cannot move out even though they try to leave. He compared this struggle to the struggle of black people to relate successfully to a hostile social situation. He said that the struggle occurred in three stages or phases:

1. "No government."

It was illegal for slaves to marry; any legacy was cut off by law; "our bodies were used, not our minds -- only our motor skills." "A slave could not be taught how to read or write," which demonstrated that even in those days, education was thought of as a way of ending slavery.

2. "Semi-government."

There was a right to read, a right to vote but only for "some of us" -- for some blacks but not for all.

3. "Self-government."

This is the most demanding stage of our struggle. We must use our own minds and bodies. During this phase, we must relate to opportunity on the one hand and motivation on the other. As a people, as a nation, we must accept the fact that we are responsible for ourselves; and, "for every right, there is a responsibility." You must accept the fact that through the grace of good will and a lot of hard work we can enter into the stage of self-government. We must run our own homes. As educators, we have a right to be heard because we are not limited by ethnicity. We must be ethnic, but we must also be ethical.

He noted that blacks have progressed from the stage of "no government" through "semi-government" to "self-government". He said blacks have grown from 3 Congressmen to 17 Congressmen; from no black mayors to 130 black mayors; from 2 million people to 7½ million people.

Reverend Jackson then used as an example the figure of Rip Van Winkle -- like Rip Van Winkle, a lot of people have slept through the new changes in social progress, glorifying nostalgia. They like to remember certain events, emphasize certain happenings and forget others. When some people interpret history they deal with the "cream" and never with the "coffee".

Revolutionary movements go through three stages:

1. Talk,
2. Struggle, and
3. Building.

When Fidel Castro was fighting Batista, he was struggling to overthrow the government. After he was successful, he put away weapons and began to build a new Cuban nation.

When the Vietnam war ended, Ho Chi Minh's task was not yet ended. Ho saw that now that the war was over, the killers and the prostitutes must become builders with a mission to build the new order. Moses in stage one said the equivalent of "let my people go." He struggled across the Red Sea and led his people out of the wilderness. Moses had to go to the mountaintop -- not to get a bigger budget -- but to receive the ten commandments. His crisis was attitudinal; his crisis was spiritual.

There are also three movements to the black experience in America:

1. Talk: "let my people go";

2. The fighting part; and

3. Building.

Blacks have now inherited the major cities. Now they must go to work to produce and excel. Once people could not correctly interpret what phase of the struggle they were experiencing; they wasted time trying to be "in" to what was "out". This is a part of the crisis in our day.

Now we have such things as postsecondary education and social mobility; but, once we begin to assume the right to wield power, people begin to take us seriously and demand a level of production. Now they say to us, if you want to run the school, "run it". But, "you can't teach what you don't know; you can't lead where you don't go."

Reverend Jackson said that he found it useful to deal with the dialectic of "will" and "skill". Teachers are involved in teaching skill, not creating will. There is a teacher level in education and a parental level. Teachers cannot supply the motivation and discipline of the parents. They cannot be substitutes for parents.

"We do well what we do most. Time Magazine recently published an article on 'Why Johnny Can't Read'. They talked about it for 30 pages and came to no conclusions. However, there are some conclusions that could be drawn. It could be said that Johnny is:

1. retarded, or
2. doesn't practice."

Johnny does well what Johnny does most. Sometimes Johnny's priorities lay in the development of his motor skills. He must do the same to develop cognitive skills.

Our country is so materialistic. Materialism is ingrained in us as a people. We have a spiritual crisis vs. a materialistic crisis. The most important crisis, factually, is the more basic one -- the spiritual crisis. We must develop again a sense of ethics and responsibility. We must develop a military discipline and direct it against the moral crisis. The death of ethics is the sabotage of spirituality.

We have a tragic situation with our young people. There are not enough new jobs to go around. When the situation calls for creation of new jobs we begin dealing basically with the notion of political payoffs. It is not a meaningful experience to rake the leaves in the public parks. Young people should be doing meaningful work. They should be working to repair the schools -- taking the graffiti off the walls. Even though we give them the opportunity to work, the motivation must come from someplace else. Educational crises sometimes suffer from a "paralysis of analysis". An educational crisis sometimes reflects what is really an ethical collapse. There must be a revival in our will to be great.

There is a virus in our ethics; something is missing on a more basic level. Cost is going up; productivity is going down.

Collapse equals no spirit. When the spirit dies, the body is finished. When everybody goes along doing "their thing", they become just like the man in the casket -- everybody is right, dead right. We have the situation where English teachers do not care about mathematics, and the math teacher who does not care how you talk.

Many of us have been too diverted by issues of race. We wonder how the children are going to get to school and don't begin to think about what the children will learn after they get there. Nobody will save us from us but us. We have an opportunity to free the whole world if we care enough to be heard and respected. We must assess where we are. This assessment will lead the teacher and the preacher and the educator to find their common place in our society. The preacher needs to go to school, the teacher needs to go to church; the parents need to go both places.

In terms of assessing the effectiveness of our program, we must determine what parameters, what measures of assistance are really most effective. We know the difference between white colleges who "accept" black students and the colleges who "accept and graduate" black students.

Early black educators accomplished much with limited funds, whether in the field of academic or vocational education. There must be both -- both hand development and mind development. We must have an integration of both vocational and academic education. With a combination of will and motivation, our people will earn their way out and learn their way out.

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION REVISITED

By: Cleveland L. Dennard

This is an occasion where I feel considerably inadequate to respond to the agenda that is before us - data definition needs of postsecondary education in the immediate years ahead, especially the nine years until 1985.

What I would suggest is that if our focus is indeed on providing the information for policy formulators, we take a hard look at the results of what we are doing to give greater meaning to initial actions.

One month and two days from today, on July 4, America will begin its Third Century as a Republic. Much of the energy for engaging in the apparently endless rounds of celebrations will accrue from the realization of the ideals that incited the founding fathers to risk their all for a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity for liberation from the tyranny of the English Crown. This generation owes a great debt to the foresight, fortitude, intelligence and tenacity of the revolutionaries for their actions in bringing about this America for Americans.

It is against this background that I have selected as my topic to discuss with you today "Postsecondary Education Revisited". Although, I shall treat the term "Postsecondary" in the context of one of its subsets, that of higher education, the points of reference are essentially germane to the postsecondary experience in American education.

Since 1970, a variety of studies have been undertaken seeking to examine educational issues that are pertinent to the times as the nation closes out two centuries of development. The first and second Newman Reports, "National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education" and "Federal Policy Issues and Data Needs in Postsecondary Education", and the Carnegie Commission Reports have sought to delineate issues that are critical to public educational policy for the present and the immediate future.

The five broad public policy issues central to each of the reports encapsulate succinctly the major issues facing American society, the 94th Congress and the respective agencies of Federal, State and local governments. These issues are:

1. equal educational opportunity,
2. manpower needs,
3. recurrent education,
4. educational diversity, and
5. research in the national interest.

Rarely in the history of the nation has the need been greater to reexamine the foundations of American democracy and the political economy that undergirds our democratic institutions. It is a matter of unremitting debate from this point forward that in order to place into perspective the issues requiring substantive actions in the decade ahead, a thorough reexamination of the foundations is required.

Central to such reexamination involving a postsecondary education is a recurring reference to a crisis in higher education and in vocational education with a feeble reference to education for careers. Such references range from the ineffectiveness of vocational training to meet manpower needs to an overproduction of college educated manpower for jobs that do not exist.

It appears that whenever social crises occur in American society, the Federal Government is the single source of expectation to adjudicate each crisis. History, however, is replete with "brush fire" reactions on the part of the Federal structure to meet critical needs identified as "social crises." A few examples here substantiate this view. Within a decade of the ending of the Revolutionary War of 1776, the Treasury of the United States was virtually depleted. Congress, in encouraging territories to become States, endorsed the Land Ordinance Act of 1789 in the Oregon Territory which set aside income from two sections of land in each township for educational purposes, thus obviating further drain on the Federal Treasury.

Nearly a century elapsed before gold was discovered on San Francisco's Barbary Coast in 1849, triggering a westward movement of population from the eastern seaboard across the plains and opening up the interior for homesteading. In addition to the necessity of engaging American Indians in mortal battle, early pioneers had relatively zero skills for farming the plains of Kansas, Nebraska or the Dakotas or laying railroads, machining parts and modernizing the wilderness. Congress responded to this social crisis with the enactment of the first Morrill Act of 1862 authorizing grants of land for the establishment of colleges of agriculture and mechanical arts.

Slightly more than a half century later, after having fought the Spanish-American War over the sinking of "The Maine" Congress observed the Japanese-Russian War of 1905 and the Germans in 1914 moving through Western Europe and started its debate on the nation's need to "catch up" with the Germans in manpower capability. In 1917, Congress enacted the Smith-Hughes Act, providing for vocational education "of less than college-grade."

Then in 1957, Fleck wrote a series of articles in Look Magazine on "Johnny's Inability to Read" and the Russians in October launched Sputnik I creating a crisis of the American educational system. Congress responded this time with the National Defense Education Act of 1958 to provide capability for the nation to "catch up" with the Russians in language, guidance and counseling, technician training, educational technology and mathematics.

Population shifts from rural to urban areas, concentrated minorities and Appalachian whites in the metropolitan urban centers with rural skills that were non-transferable to the industrial markets. Congress again responded with the Area Redevelopment and Training Act. In the following year, 1963, the Smith-Hughes Act was rewritten; by mid-1964 Congress responded to the demonstrations of the Civil Rights Movement with the Civil Rights Act. By 1964, Congress enacted an Economic Opportunity Act to provide additional substance to the Civil Rights Act. So from once a century to once per half century to every time the Congress meets, it is in the process of providing some kind of "brush fire" reaction to the social crisis that obtains in the nation. I tend to describe this phenomenon of attempting to adjudicate social crisis in American society as "placing a finger in the dike."

This "brush fire" approach to effectuating public policy during the past two centuries has contributed little to the ordering of priorities to meet postsecondary educational needs of the nation.

Let us then examine some of the assumptions undergirding the role of education in meeting the democratic and economic needs of the American society.

The concept of democracy as developed by the founding fathers was designed to guarantee liberties of person and opinion - freedom of religion, freedom of speech and of the press, freedom from the insane brutalities practiced in the civil and ecclesiastical administration of justice and the punishment of crimes. These were the freedoms that all men could understand and from which all men could benefit.

The concepts were incorporated into the Constitution of the United States by a young Virginian, Thomas Jefferson, who grew up near the banks of the Potomac River not too far from Warrenton, Virginia. Jefferson, of course, served as America's Ambassador to France during the period preceding the French Revolution. Being on hand at the time that poor people petitioned the government and Marie Antionette about the high unemployment rate, about the poor educational opportunities and about the excesses of government toward the poor, Jefferson experienced her classic statement to the poor of "let them eat cake" and saw her beheaded in the city square. Returning to the banks of the Potomac, Jefferson wrote a social contract for the State of Virginia creating the University of Virginia at Charlottesville and the State system of public education. His efforts in drafting the Constitution were to assure that the experiences he shared in France would never be replicated on his native American soil.

The notions of liberty, equality and fraternity were well ingrained within Jefferson as a democratic basis for public and private institutions. The concept of the "hands-off" or "let alone" laissez-faire theory of economics, although in reality a political theory, did not have pragmatic meaning to Jefferson.

Adam Smith's 1773 treatise on an "Inquiry into the Wealth of Nations" that triggered new idealism about private economic enterprise in Great Britain greatly influenced Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin. Smith cited the need for the limitation of governmental regulation of the private economy and the freeing of the creative energies of the citizenry to respond to the ebbing and flowing of the marketplace to meet the demand-supply requirements in pursuit of profits. This notion clearly delineated a major departure in political economic theory by establishing the principle of private ownership of property with minimal governmental intervention. In practice, this notion was typical of the 16th century Machiavellian economic posture of how to do unto others before they do unto you.

The 18th century Jeffersonian notions of a democratizing process for institutions and individual liberty when combined with 16th century economic roots leave a chasm so broad that public policy formulation does not appear to attempt to bridge it.

The promotion of higher education and some aspects of vocational education by the Federal Government since 1862 through categorical financing has left the more productive question of what are the national needs of American society that public and private institutions should meet, exclusive of research in the national interest.

It is this question that requires the examination for my further remarks on "Postsecondary Education Revisited". Inherent in this examination is the premise that public policy leads to private initiative in American society. It is obvious to any serious student of public policy that the process of the body politic is not guilty of rational decision-making with respect to public policy to achieve predetermined ends. Such a notion smacks of "managed economies," or establishing quotas of Americans to be educated to meet the societal definitions of need in contrast to permitting the marketplace to ebb and flow, with each individual choosing his own niche and taking his chances for a measure of success. This concept of individual choice was indeed reasonable and probably valid at a point in American history when more than seventy percent of the population resided in agrarian areas, in contrast to their concentration in the fifty largest metropolitan urban centers.

And if the fundamental law of history is changed, then it is not reasonable to assume that this concept excludes the ideas of both the democratic and political economy notions that the nation has held for two centuries.

Since 1960, the five previously cited public policy issues have emerged as national goals with varying degrees of definition. Each is presented herewith in the context of their present meaning, from my perspective:

1. Providing Equal Educational Opportunity

The enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, in addition to the comments of the Supreme Court in 1954 following its ruling in Brown v. Board of Education, Topeka, Kansas, clearly established equal educational opportunity as public policy. This policy incorporates the idea of opportunity as public policy. This policy incorporates the idea of opportunity for student initial entry into colleges, universities and schools as well as a choice of curricular offerings and continuity in a course of study until the initial objectives set by the student have been achieved.

Obviously, the decision by Judge Pratt in the Adams v. Richardson case indicates that the Office of Education and HEW have not exercised their statutory duty in "cutting off" Federal funds to those States that have not submitted a satisfactory State plan for dismantling their dual systems of public higher education twenty years after the Supreme Court ruling and twelve years following the enactment of Titles VI and IX of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Further, at the secondary school level involving students who are involuntary early school leavers, the Supreme Court ruled in the Goss v. Lopez case concerning student suspensions from recently desegrated public schools in Columbus, Ohio, that students suspended for "misconduct" for up to ten days without a hearing was unconstitutional and that such suspensions must provide for the protection of the individual rights of citizens with due process hearings. The court states that a suspension of more than ten days "may require more formal procedures" than simply a notice and a hearing. However, it does not outline the procedures. These are, of course, giant steps toward providing badly needed protection in the public schools for the rights of students who invariably are black males cut off from the possibility of graduating from high school and subsequently becoming eligible to seek access to postsecondary choices. The magnitude of this problem in the several States has been a major concern of private foundations and their funding priorities for nearly six years.

The National Center for Education Statistics must devise a survey capability to ascertain the extent to which this group of Americans are, in fact, denied the opportunity to complete secondary education as a first step toward subsequent opportunities to pursue a postsecondary education experience. The opportunity to pursue such may well depend on this initiative.

The response by the U.S. Office of Education to State plans for dismantling dual public higher education systems as submitted by the States of Georgia, Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi, South Carolina, North Carolina, Maryland, Florida, Virginia and Alabama is clearly inconsistent with the national policy on equal educational opportunity.

2. Meeting Manpower Needs

Any serious discussion of manpower needs in the American political economy must of necessity take into account public policy on full employment. As early as 1944, during World War II, Senator Murray and Congressman Kilgore introduced a full employment economy bill that became the Full Employment Economy Act of 1946. The Bill provided for the President of the United States to establish (a) a declaration of policy, (b) the national production and employment budget, (c) preparation of the National Budget, and (d) the Joint Committee on the National Budget, including a Council of Economic Advisors.

Not the least interesting and significant part of the Bill was the declaration of public policy. As stated, it was the policy of the United States to "(1) foster free competitive enterprise ... in developing the natural resources of the United States; (2) recognize the rights of all Americans able and willing to work to have access to useful, remunerative, regular and full-time employment; and (3) insure that at all times the existence of sufficient employment opportunities to enable all Americans -- freely to exercise that right." Furthermore, in order to carry out these policies, "it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to pursue consistent economic policies and programs that will, first of all, stimulate private enterprise and other non-federal investments and expenditures; and if that proves inadequate, it is the further responsibility of the Federal Government to provide such volume of Federal investments and expenditures as may be needed to assure continuing full employment." More simply stated, if there are ninety million Americans able and willing to work, then there must be ninety million jobs provided for them. If the jobs can be provided by the private enterprise system, well and good. If not, then the Federal Government must aid private enterprise in expanding its investments and expenditures, and if that is not sufficient to provide the jobs, then the Federal Government must make investments and expenditures.

The Council on Economic Advisors interpreted a full employment economy in 1946 as representing ninety-six percent of the employable labor force at any point in time on the assumption that specific social legislation would absorb the four percent. We came to accept the notion of four percent unemployment as an acceptable level of unemployment.

Thirty years to the month, Senator Hubert H. Humphrey and Congressman Augustus Hawkins introduced in the Senate and House of Representatives HR 50, a bill to establish within three years a full employment economy at the ninety-seven percent level for the United States. This bill is presently before both houses of Congress.

Postsecondary educators are totally aware of the fact that a four percent unemployment rate nationally has not existed since 1962. Unemployment rates for black youths have not dropped below eight percent in a single year during the thirty years since the end of World War II. As recently as 1974, unemployment nationwide exceeded 8.9 percent of the employable age population. Only in times of national emergency has our nation been able to generate sufficient employment demand in both the private and public sectors to meet the total needs of the available American manpower study.

There does not appear to exist any correlation between curricular offerings and the sectors of the economy on which manpower needs are determined.

The American economy is organized into nine sectors. Each represents a broad cluster of curricular offerings. Yet curricula are rarely identified as subsets of the following sectors as a basis for planning manpower development that obviates the possibility of educating for undue shortages and/or surpluses. What are those sectors? We assume that the national income and personal income of the nation grows out of:

a) agriculture, forestry and fisheries,
b) mining,
c) contract construction,
d) manufacturing,
e) transportation,
f) communications and public utilities,
g) wholesale and retail trade,
h) finance, insurance and real estate, and
i) services: medical, hotel, legal, personal and governmental.

In order to assure that a reasonable match exists in the marketplace, nine sectors of the economy and the available supply generated by the postsecondary education institutions, the development, implementation and quality control must show a high degree of correlation.

Preparation for careers in the American economy must take into account the fact that such sectors tend to grow at differing rates of speed. When the economy is stimulated such acceleration invariably is measured in comparison with the growth rate of the population within selected metropolitan areas or the nation as a whole.

Cooling off periods in the economy that limit expansionary growth of sectors whether planned or imposed, by internal controls or external forces, do not militate against career preparation due to the short-term impact of slowdowns in the economy.

The beginning of the Third Century in America requires a fresh look at the relationship between student access to educational opportunity and the purposes of education in a democracy. There are some realities that are inescapable. The American economy in the Twentieth Century has grown to depend on "cheap" energy as a basis for its annual average growth as measured by the Gross National Product (GNP). Yet, within recent months, policies developed by the Organization of Oil Exporting Countries, external to the United States, have decided that the American economy would no longer nor ever again flourish on cheap energy.

In response, American public policy with respect to monetary regulations were "beefed-up". Inventories of automobiles and everything else were reduced and automotive plants closed. Motorists arrived in gasoline lines bumper to bumper, the balance of payments escalated, and the unemployment nearly tripled. Private initiative in the American economy responded, insecure, but responded to a new phenomenon of double digit inflation in the midst of a depressed economy. And, as we approach July 4, the economy is on the upsurge.

Blacks and other minorities are not in a position to be resilient to such changes in the economy nor are they provided ongoing educational opportunities in curricular areas that are geared to the demands of the several sectors of the economy.

3. & 4. Recurrent Education and Educational Diversity

In May 1965, an article was published in the U.S. Department of Labor's Monthly Labor Review in which an occupational analysis by educational levels was examined. Of the 300 occupations listed, the top highest paying groups had an average educational level of 17 years. The next 15 occupational groups ranging from electricians to printers had an average formal educational level of 9.8 years. What appears to have been obvious was the presence of negotiated collective bargaining agreements in selected industries representing a greater weighted value in career income achievement than did educational levels. As data gatherers for policy formulators, I recommend that you "revisit" that report.

The bridging of the notions for democratizing the populace through postsecondary education with a sound capability for maintaining and improving our system of private enterprise is the major challenge of this decade.

The National Center might well profit from a redesign of its data base with an end in view toward integrating the fall enrollments with the degrees and formal awards matched against the attrition rates in the labor force of the various sectors of the economy.

Promoting recurrent education and stimulating educational diversity are embodied in the true context of meeting manpower needs for our free enterprise system.

5. Research in the National Interest

Encouraging research in the national interest suggests that the Office of Education should know more about the problems of minorities. There are postsecondary institutions with graduate capabilities that are statutorily assured the vast majority of Federal research funds annually appropriated. Yet many undergraduate four-year institutions, public and private, could contribute effectively to new knowledge through pure or action research on the issues of equal educational opportunity and meeting manpower needs.

Special opportunities are needed to enable institutions with historic experience in educating blacks and other minority students to share, through funded research, techniques acquired over a period of a century in enrolling, educating and graduating their products.

The National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, an association of black college presidents, cites statistics indicating that seventy-eight percent of all black four-year college graduates in the United States are products of their member institutions.

This untapped resource looms large as an organized research potential for public policy analytic studies when substantively funded. Data requirements for public policy in post-secondary education must ultimately be defined to encompass Commerce Department, Census Bureau, Labor Department Statistics, personal income, sectorial analysis of the economy and other Federal sources of data. Operating within the Federal establishment with a wide range of data bases already in place, what appears to be needed is the coordinating of files with a mark four type language that would generate a capacity for a management sense of serially produced analytic data reports rather than annually produced print-outs.

Charles Dickens, in describing the period preceding the French Revolution in his "Tale of Two Cities", stated it succintly: "It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity, it was the season of Light, it was the season of Darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair, we had everything before us, we had nothing before us, ..."

I believe that the beginning of the Third Century of the Republic is the best of times for some; it is the worst of times for others; it is indeed an age of wisdom; and it is still a longitudinal period of foolishness.

The past two centuries have been epochs of belief for some and an inconceivable period of disbelief for others; that this is the season of light, that this is the spring of hope, we have everything before us, intelligence, goodwill and integrity for ordering the priorities of definitive information on which public policy can be formulated to modify the conditions of American life through postsecondary educational opportunities, and thereby improve the happiness, effectiveness and welfare of all men.

THE CASE AGAINST COLLEGE

By: Caroline Bird

The first thing everyone wants to know about me is whether I went to college myself, and if so, would I do it again. Let me start out by saying yes, I did, and I would.

I loved college. Back in the 1930's, when I went, it was even harder for a girl to convert a liberal arts degree into a paying job than it is today. After leaving Vassar in 1934, I did not land on a regular payroll until World War II. During the 30-odd years since, however, I have, without a break, made a living as a journalist and even written books used in sociology courses without the benefit of a single course in either journalism or sociology.

Did college help me? Yes, it did. But it is my embarrassing duty to tell high school graduates entering college this fall that college won't do them anywhere near as much good as it did me.

The reason is statistical. When I got out of college, fewer than six percent of the women my age had that sheepskin. And contrary to the prevalent notion that everyone needs a college education to live in this complicated world, we simply have not increased the proportion of jobs requiring higher education anywhere near as fast as we have increased the proportion of college graduates.

It's becoming academically fashionable to maintain, with righteous indignation, that college is "hot for the money." Agitated college professors accuse me of having fabricated the idea that college is "for the money" in order to make money selling my book, The Case Against College; the Chancellor of the University of Denver unwittingly advertised it as "intellectual pornography."

Alas, it is not Caroline Bird who says that college is for the money. It is the great majority of college students and particularly their parents who foot the bills. Realistically, now, how many of our millions of college students would quit tomorrow if they were convinced that their diploma would not command more money, nicer work, more prestige, or a better position in life? Many, of course, would stay on in college simply because they could not find anything better to do, but how many would stay because they liked to study and wanted to learn?

Yet college is precisely for those few. They are not hard to spot. If you have been going to school all your life, you know whether you like books and studying. If you do, college is for you. You should go. If you don't have the money, taxpayers should help you to go. But liking books does not mean that you are better than people who like to fix pipes. That old Greek who said that philosophers should be kings was a philosopher himself, and it's a good thing he didn't get his way.

College is not for the money. It is easier to see this now than it was in the 1950's, when an expanding economy desperately needed the potential doctors, lawyers, and engineers who were driving cabs for lack of money to get professional training. Well, we fixed that. We built a huge educational establishment. We have provided financial aid so that we now retrieve all but a very few of the academically able who are without funds. In the process, however, we have sent to college large numbers of young people who are not profiting very much. We are learning that we cannot make everyone upper-class by sending everyone to college.

Our attempt to do this has devalued college as an investment in future earnings for the majority who go for that crass reason. The cash value of a diploma is plummeting so fast that it is hard to tell what, if anything, it will be worth to those entering this fall. In 1969, males with four years of college earned 53 percent more than high school graduates. In 1973, four short years later, this advantage had dropped to only 40 percent. A college education returned 11 to 12 percent on the investment in out-of-pocket cost, plus the foregone earnings of the student in 1969. In 1974, the return had dropped to 7 or 8 percent, less than the return on quite respectable money market instruments that year. God knows what it will be "worth" for the class of 1980.

Now, a college degree has never been a very reliable investment in future earnings. Even in the good old 1950's, 30 percent of graduates never earned more than the average of high-school graduates. Banks have always known as much. They wouldn't lend a student money to invest in his education until the Federal government insured the loan.

But doesn't college "pay" in non-economic terms? Are not college graduates happier, healthier, more ambitious, more altruistic, more appreciative of truth and beauty, more apt to stay married, and generally better examples of the human species than those who don't go? Yes they are, but it's not clear that college can take the credit. The overwhelming evidence is not that college made people better, but that in the last generation, the better people were attracted to college in the first place. The reputation of a college is made at the admissions office, and that is why you find the only rugs on many a campus there.

The image of the educated farmer reading the Latin classics as he rests from the plow is intriguing, but we do not find these noble farmers in America, 1976. On the contrary, a careful study of job satisfaction made by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan discloses that the most discontented workers are the young, college-educated, white-collar jobholders doing work which does not utilize their education. About 22 percent of college graduates now do "educationally upgraded" jobs -- jobs that formerly were done by high-school graduates -- and the ranks of these potentially unhappy workers are growing. Employers hire college graduates for these jobs because they can get them, not because their education is needed.

In his mind-blowing book, "Inequality", Harvard Professor of Education Christopher Jencks says that "the biggest single source of income difference seems to be the fact that men from high-status families have higher incomes than men from low-status families even when they enter the same occupations, have the same amount of education and have the same test scores." "College," concludes Jencks, "is an expensive aptitude test whose cost is born by the applicants."

A good part of the cost, of course, is borne by taxpayers, even in private colleges. What do they get out of financing ever less effective aptitude tests for private employers?

It used to be easy to assume that college made people public spirited when only the public spirited went to college -- when the clergy still left its mark on higher education.

Inspired by Jefferson's noble vision of an educated citizenry dedicated to science, morality, and the arts, we easily assumed that more education would remedy everything that ailed us. College for just about everybody was going to increase the GNP, beat the Russians to the moon, cut crime, promote the arts, fund symphony orchestras, and improve the tone of political life.

It is embarrassing, in this post-Watergate time, to look back on those claims.

The proportion of college men and women in the year-round labor force has risen from 26 percent in 1953 to 52 percent in 1972, but I draw a veil over the rise, if any, in public morality.

The professoriate is reduced to arguing that the rise in college-educated citizenry has nothing to do with muggings or money laundering -- or, for that matter, a rise in violent crime, including suicide, perpetrated by those of college age.

A liberal education OUGHT to make the citizenry wiser, more compassionate, more rational. It sounds plausible when Alan Pifer advises us appeal to young people on the grounds that, and I quote, "HIGHER EDUCATION HELPS INDIVIDUALS DEVELOP INTELLECTUAL ABILITIES, HUMANISTIC UNDERSTANDINGS AND AESTHETIC SENSITIVITIES THAT WILL ENABLE THEM TO ENJOY LIFE MORE FULLY AND CONTRIBUTE MORE EFFECTIVELY TO THE WELFARE OF MANKIND."

But his high road reminds me of a song popular in my youth. Some of you who were adult in World War II may recall it. It started out with the line -

"HE WAS A JERK, WHEN HE WENT INTO THE ARMY."

and concluded:

"AFTER THE STORM AND THE STRIFE
OF MILITARY LIFE
HE CAME OUT --
CHANGED IN MANY RESPECTS, BUT STILL A JERK."

It has only been since we have put almost half our young adults through postsecondary education that we have learned how little you can do to change the majority of 18-year olds. The fallacy of this reasoning was dramatically demonstrated, to my mind, by the surprising argument presented by my neighbor, Leon Botstein, the young President of Bard College on the Hudson. Leon maintained, when we were set against each other on a TV talk show, that everyone should go to college because high schools haven't been able to teach eighteen-year olds to read, write, and figure their gas mileage. To my mind, this is a splendid argument for taking some of the money (and maybe some of the classroom) space) lavished on state-supported colleges and spending it on getting the multiplication table through the heads of everyone in the seventh grade. Blacks, now poorly prepared for everyday life, would profit more by this reallocation of education dollars, but all would profit. There's more you can do to improve a six-year old than an 18-year old, and your dollar goes farther, too.

As taxpayers, we must take a closer look at the college building spree of the past ten years. With the best will in the world, we have created a monster.

Unconsciously, we have had as our goal to provide postsecondary education for EVERYONE. Leon Botstein is not the only educator to urge it. Universal higher education so that all will be "privileged" -- so that all can become UPPER-CLASS is the ideal behind open admissions. To a degree unequaled in any other society, we have moved towards it. Unlike any other country -- and our great heart is perhaps to be saluted -- our financial aid system is founded on need rather than merit.

We send about 40 percent of the college age to something beyond high school. Canada, the runner up, 24 percent. England, 11-12 percent.

And as we send more and more, the costs rise and the returns decline. AS THE NUMBERS RISE, WE SPEND MORE DOLLARS ON STUDENTS WHO ARE LESS LIKELY TO RETURN ANY BENEFITS EITHER TO THEMSELVES OR TO THE NATION.

An economist has figured that universal schooling to age 22 -- the avowed goal of many -- would have cost us $47.5 billion in 1970-1971 -- a year in which corporate profits were $35 billion. I need not remind this audience that the costs of college are now higher (and the corporate profits against which they have been compared lower) than was the case five years ago.

ONE OF THE MOST TELLING ARGUMENTS FOR EXPANDING COLLEGE CAPACITIES IN RECESSION IS THAT THERE ARE NO JOBS FOR KIDS. INDEED, THIS IS THE REASON, TO MY MIND, WHY THE EXPECTED DECLINE IN ENROLLMENTS HAS NOT TAKEN PLACE. WITH THE FINANCIAL AID SYSTEMS WE HAVE, COLLEGE IS NOT ONLY PREFERABLE TO THE KIND OF JOBS AVAILABLE, IT MAY ACTUALLY "PAY" BETTER THAN ANY ALTERNATIVE. CHEAPEST THING TO DO WITH AN EIGHTEEN-YEAR OLD IS TO HAVE HIS MOTHER HOUSE AND FEED HIM, AND ENTERTAIN HIM AT A COMMUNITY COLLEGE.

College has become welfare for the middle-classes. This is unfair insofar as college serves to provide a credential -- an empty credential -- on the basis of which some citizens could get ahead of others, and through which employers could be saved the trouble of screening applicants whose differences are too marginal to be worth detecting.

So, what to do?

If the objective is social equality, there are more efficient ways to get it than to run everyone through the lockstep of college. PEOPLE ARE NOT POOR BECAUSE THEY LACK COLLEGE. THEY ARE POOR BECAUSE THEY LACK MONEY.

I have four programs, cheaper and fairer than redressing the social imbalance by universal higher education.

1. Teach everybody to read, write, and figure their gas mileage in the seventh grade. Take money from colleges and spend it there, if you have to.

2. UNCOUPLE JOBS AND DIPLOMAS. The major remedy to the overblown college lockstep has to be political. Academics wield power by deciding who shall be given the diploma which employers use to sort the sheep from the goats. Like the Popes who hold the keys to the Kingdom of Heaven, the professoriate does not answer to anyone, least of all those whom it sorts.

   The remedy could be very simple. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination in employment on the basis of religion, race, sex, and age. I propose adding "and years of schooling." This would shift the burden of proof from candidate to employer. A diploma could be required only if it actually predicted achievement on the job. The change would put colleges and training schools of all kinds back in the business of preparing either for employment tests or the non-economic "higher things of life."

This is not as far-fetched as it sounds. We have a beginning in institutions like the Foreign Service of the United States which accepts beginners on the basis of a skill examination, amply prepared for by a liberal arts curriculum. This is the direct opposite of the way we license teachers, by accepting the diploma as the standard.

FOR THOSE HIGHLY BESOUGHT FEW POSITIONS, SUCH AS PHYSICIAN, LAWYER, OR EXECUTIVE, WE MIGHT SET PERFORMANCE-RELATED STANDARDS AND THEN CHOOSE AMONG THE MANY WHO QUALIFY BY LOTTERY OR AUCTION. THIS WOULD DO AWAY WITH THE PROBLEMS OF DISCRIMINATION AT ONE CRACK.

3. We might fund alternative ways of growing up and preparing for vocation. There is no mystery about what alternatives exist. The vanguard young are seeking them out already -- APPRENTICESHIP, TRAVEL, LEARNING JOBS, INDUSTRY TRAINING PROGRAMS, PERSONAL ADVENTURE OR VENTURE, VOLUNTEER WORK, AND JUST PLAIN LEAVING HOME TO WORK IN THE DRUGSTORE OF SOME OTHER

TOWN FOR SIX MONTHS; TRYING ONE JOB AFTER ANOTHER TO SEE WHAT FITS.

It's easy to brainstorm suggestions. We might forgive taxes for employers willing to take on beginners. We might set up a national service plan for all high school graduates that would allow them to try various fields. We are trying hundreds of grass roots pilot programs in work study. They are the wave of the future - a new relationship between school and work.

What about the liberal arts, the sciences, the humanities? They can never flourish by compulsory schooling in them. A liberal education cannot be administered like a pill. But we can make the arts and humanities available to people when and where and in what doses they want it. We have the technology to bring the curriculum into every living room -- to set up discussion groups in every library. We no longer need to ship people to convents and monasteries where books are chained.

We are making great beginnings in lifelong learning and adult education, and for once, middle-aged women returning to the mainstream are leading the way. So, I propose a national humanities network to bring the liberal arts to people of all life stages.

4. For students graduating from high school

this June, I have a practical suggestion. If you feel like studying for its own sake, go on to college. If you don't, make a deal with your parents. Ask them for the money they would spend on your first year of college all in one lump sum on your promise that you will make it do -- or wash dishes, if you blow it -- for one solid year. In other words, tell them, "Please, parents, I'd rather take responsibility for myself."

The options aren't funded now, but they exist. You can buy an old jalopy and drive across the country. You can do volunteer work in programs offering a subsistence. You can try a series of jobs. You can go work on a farm. You can help out a political candidate, tutor disadvantaged kids in school, or help in a hospital. You can try to get apprenticed to a trade. You can go to the woods and write a novel. You can, in short, act as elites have always acted.

In the past few years, we've had middle-aged Moms going to work to send their 18-year old kids to college. Both might get more out of it if it were the other way around. Let the 18-year olds work for a few years while Mom goes to college.

Thank you.

III. GROUP SEMINAR REPORTS

REPORT OF SEMINAR GROUP I

> "Looking toward a single survey for collegiate and noncollegiate postsecondary institutions, assessing the similarities and differences in data and definitions."

One of the major issues of Federal educational policy is the determination of the total postsecondary universe, both collegiate and noncollegiate, and the exploration of ways and means of delineating stratification procedures for presentation of data for this expanded universe, while, at the same time, continuing trend analyses of the traditional higher education universe.

Conclusions

1. It is impractical to have a single survey package to encompass both the "Collegiate" and the "Noncollegiate" universes. The only items identified as yielding comparable data were the following:

A. Institutional Characteristics, i.e.

- name
- address
- telephone
- programs (only in terms of listings, see item 4)
- control
    - .. public
    - .. private
- accreditation

B. Students

- unduplicated annual enrollment
- distribution by sex
- race/ethnicity
- age

C. Employees, distributed by:

- occupational category
- sex
- race/ethnicity

2. The fundamental commonality across both universes is the student and his aspirations.

3. The term "noncollegiate" should be dropped because of its negative connotation. Further, the term is too restrictive since many institutions in the "collegiate" category offer programs that are duplicative of those offered by institutions in the "noncollegiate" category.

4. Serious problems in definitions exist, the most serious being the lack of standard and compatible definitions of:

- A. programs
- B. student goals
- C. faculty load
- D. student load

5. A study should be made to explore the possibility of gathering data across both universes on the basis of students, rather than by institutions.

Principle Points of Discussion

Three primary questions arise in the conduct of a survey program:

1. Are the data needed (by whom, for what purpose, how frequently)?
2. Are the data available?
3. If the data are needed and are available, would they be reported?

The group was in general agreement that the HEGIS data were needed by a variety of publics, but no conclusions were reached as to the validity of the needs, nor was any attempt made to establish priorities for the needs. It was generally agreed that, except for the HEGIS survey on migration of students, there is very little requested in the current HEGIS package which does not consist of data which should be readily available for good management of an institution. At the same time, it was recognized that adequate data systems do not exist at all institutions.

While the response rate to HEGIS is about 94%, there was strong feeling that there would be a very low response rate from the noncollegiate sector to a survey as comprehensive as HEGIS, and probably no response to requests for financial data.

The full span of postsecondary education is not covered by the institutions surveyed in the two universes of collegiate and noncollegiate institutions because "in-house" training by business and industry, as well as educational programs offered by recreational, cultural and religious facilities are not included unless they are offered in an educational institution.

There was some discussion of the impact that the State Postsecondary Education Commissions (1202 Commissions) might have in stimulating survey responses from the noncollegiate sector. While theoretically these commissions were established to encompass both universes, it was felt that the noncollegiate sector did not stand to gain by furnishing detailed data for total State postsecondary planning purposes.

The feasibility of a common survey form to collect basic data from both universes was covered, the primary purpose of the form being to classify an institution in either category. This was finally dismissed because it ultimately would result in an additional survey form, since the HEGIS instrument requires certain data necessary to determine an institution's inclusion in the directory, and these data are not applicable to the noncollegiate sector.

There was considerable discussion of the importance of emphasizing the student and his goals rather than categories of institutions. Student goals were divided roughly into two categories -- career and leisure. One of the major difficulties cited in comparing data from the two universes was that the collegiate sector used data related to degrees earned, whereas the noncollegiate sector related to competencies.

Another method of much discussion was the relationship of HEGIS data to labor force data and the need to consider categories of students in relation to occupational fields rather than academic disciplines. It was pointed out that the National Science Foundation desired more information gathered on technical education than is now available, but not at the expense of data collected currently.

Much of the seminar time was taken up with discussion of what data are collected currently from each universe and the problem that the "noncollegiate" sector would provide only those data that it considered useful to itself or required by law.

There was a short discussion of the possibility of greater refinement in identifying categories of institutions, primarily on the basis of the aspirations of the students. It was pointed out that the "collegiate" universe contained many highly specialized institutions such as art schools, seminaries and rabbinical schools whose graduates do not enter the normal work force. While some consideration was given to excluding information about these schools from the "collegiate" universe and presenting it separately, no definite conclusion was reached.

Seminar Participants

Dr. Robert Walhaus, Chairperson
Mr. John Pateros, Seminar Specialist

Mr. Richard M. Beazley
Mr. Clark Bouwman
Dr. Robert Calvert
Mr. Howard Geer
Mr. William A. Goddard
Mr. Felix Lindsay
Ms. Naomi McCracken
Ms. Linda O'Connor
Mr. William Odom
Mr. Arthur Podolsky
Dr. John Putnam
Mr. Fred Sedorchuk
Mr. Rolf Wulfsberg

REPORT OF SEMINAR GROUP II

"The survey reduction program: The Federal Reports Act; Attachment A to OMB Circular A-40; and guidelines for reducing public reporting to Federal agencies."

One of the major chronic problems of NCES has been the reconciliation of pressures from data users vis-a-vis data providers. This situation has currently become aggravated because of administrative pressures to reduce data requests on the one hand and to include racial/ethnic data items on the other in order to reduce duplication.

The first order of business of the task force on the reduction of burden was to develop an 11-item agenda of issues which needed to be discussed. Four of the agenda items had been suggested by NCES. The 11 issues were:

1. Are there survey efforts which could be dropped?
2. Are there survey efforts which could be done with less frequency?
3. In what kinds of surveys could sampling be utilized?
4. In what kinds of surveys should there be less detail?
5. The appropriateness of combining compliance data with general purpose statistical data as a method of reducing burden.
6. Defining a new measure of burden.
7. The problem of changes in questions and format and their contribution to burden.
8. Emerging needs and their impact on burden.
9. Provision of technical assistance.
10. Survey design techniques which could be used to reduce burden.
11. The use of general statistical data for administrative purposes.

Agenda Items 1 to 4

The first four agenda items suggested by NCES were discussed as a unit. It was not possible to separate questions of frequency and sampling and problems of the number and complexity of surveys. It was difficult to discuss the dropping of surveys or even the reduction in detail without some notion of requirements. The first recommendation of the group, therefore, was that NCES conduct a "user survey" to be a major input into a requirements analysis. The group felt that such a user survey should be conducted in such a way as to quantify the needs for data. Although the group did not feel it had enough information to make specific recommendations about particular surveys that could be dropped, detail which could be eliminated, or information which could be collected less frequently, they did feel that there was a great probability that some reductions could be made. On that assumption, a number of ideas were discussed and several were recommended to NCES for consideration. Among those ideas was the possibility of using rotating panels from which certain information would be collected in different years.

There was also a discussion of the development of a common data core. The New York State Department of Education, for example, has a 90-item data core which they feel includes all of the information needed for planning and evaluation. The group also discussed the possibility of periodic censuses, with sample data only being collected during the intervening years. The group specifically recommended that NCES conduct a trend analysis for each item to determine the amount of change expected from year to year. It was felt that this kind of analysis was needed before any firm decisions on frequency of data collection could be made.

Agenda Item 5

There have been efforts, going back almost a decade, to reduce the burden on educational institutions by combining general statistical data requests with data requests for civil rights compliance purposes. This consolidation has now begun to take place. The HEGIS "Opening Fall Enrollment" questionnaire, which will be distributed shortly, combines data required by the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) with information requested by NCES. However, a number of people have begun to question the appropriateness of that change. The panel did not feel that it wished to make a specific recommendation on this issue, but the members were very uneasy about the prospects. Some felt that it was philosophically inappropriate to combine voluntary data collection items with mandatory compliance data. There also seemed to be a feeling that this was, in some respects, a breach of an agreement between the institutions and the Federal Government to provide statistical data.

Some technical concerns were also raised by the panel. The race/ethnic data required by OCR are collected by "observation". In many institutions with tens of thousands of students it is clearly impossible for any set of officials to observe and make a judgement about each student. Most of the larger institutions conduct a voluntary survey requesting that the students provide information on their race and ethnic background. It was generally agreed that these voluntary data are of relatively low quality. Some work that had been done indicated that compliance records account for only 75 to 80 percent of the enrollment as reported in HEGIS. The concern, therefore, was that the institutions might simply aggregate the race/ethnic data generated by these voluntary surveys to provide the total enrollment figures, thus seriously degrading the HEGIS totals.

Another concern was voiced that many institutions in order to obtain high quality data would add questions concerning race and ethnicity to preenrollment forms. This fear raised the specter of increasing the number of civil rights violations because of the availability of race/ethnic data prior to the admissions decision.

The only recommendation, therefore, that the seminar would make was that NCES carefully monitor the collection of the Opening Fall Enrollment Survey data in 1976 to try to detect any problems.

Agenda Item 6

It was generally recognized that the number of forms or even the estimate of the number of manhours required to fill a particular form were not the best measures of burden on the respondent. The group attempted to examine the issue of burden to determine whether there was a way of developing an appropriate single comprehensive measure. While no such single comprehensive measure was developed, some of the elements of burden were identified. First, of course, was the "manhour" resource expenditure; another element was dollar cost; and a third was the real or perceived utility of the data.

Most of the information about institutions is derived from either automated or manual information systems. The cost of establishing and maintaining these information systems cannot be readily translated into manhours but does represent a real part of the burden on the institutions. To the extent that the information being requested is required for the management of the institution, the burden could be considered minimal. To the extent, however, that the information goes beyond the normal management requirements, costs associated with its storage and retrieval could be a substantial burden on the institution.

The group also felt that the perception of the burden depended in some large part on the perception of the utility of the data -- the utility both to the data supplier and to the data recipient. The group also felt that the burden could be reduced if the provider was reimbursed for providing the data. There was a fairly extensive discussion of the possibilities of providing some form of positive incentive to the institutions. It was pointed out that the Veterans Administration, for example, does provide a token $3.00 for preparing an information form that they require. While this was seen as a grossly inadequate payment, it was still viewed as a step in the right direction. The group, therefore, recommended that NCES thoroughly examine the possibility of fully or partially reimbursing voluntary survey respondents.

The cost of this proposal, particularly in the present budget climate, was seen as a serious constraint. However, the group felt that, depending on the size of the payment, such reimbursement could be cost-effective by increasing both the timeliness of the results, the completeness of the results, and the quality of the data provided and by reducing the number and cost of follow-ups required. However, the group did not feel that such a reimbursement procedure should be used for compliance data or for information required as part of the grant process.

Agenda Item 7

One of the problems frequently pointed out by data providers is that changes in content or format of the request frequently excessively increase the effort required to produce the information. Participants felt that any requesting agency, including NCES, should make every effort to minimize the number of changes from year to year in their requests. However, the group also recognized the inevitability of change and the need for flexibility in data base construction in order to meet these changes. The recommendation was made again that a common core of data be developed and that all institutions participating in HEGIS be asked to utilize this core. Thus, new requirements, based on statute or other needs, could be added to the common core in the form of a trailer. The common core itself could also be modified as required.

Agenda Item 8

The discussion of change led inevitably to a further discussion of emerging needs. Some of the members of the group were fearful that the concern for reduction of burden was being permitted to outweigh the recognition of need for data to meet emerging requirements. While the group took no position, there was general agreement that NCES would have to be responsive to emerging needs, but that it should try to anticipate needs rather than to follow a largely reactive role as they have in the past. In this way, they could effectively coordinate their activities so as to reduce the impact of these increased data requirements.

Agenda Item 9

The recommendation of the development of a "common core" and the need for flexible data bases led to the recommendation that the Center either provide or facilitate the provision of technical assistance to the institutions participating in HEGIS. In this way, also, the burden on the provider could be minimized.

The group also discussed the development of a looseleaf training manual. It was felt that this would be particularly useful for giving the institutions which provide the data a preview of what future requirements would be. If HEGIS were to be developed with rotating panels or with several years of sample data between censuses it would be helpful to the provider to have information on the survey patterns in advance. The manual would thus reduce burden by permitting and encouraging the orderly development of the information systems required to provide the needed data. The group specifically recommended that NCES develop such a looseleaf training manual.

Agenda Item 10

Many other useful techniques were discussed relating to the design of surveys or the construction of questionnaires which could ultimately reduce burden. For example, the problems arising from combining two data requirements in matrix form were discussed. It is obvious that if two data sets each requiring five data elements are added together, there would be no increase in the total number of cells of data collected. However, if the same two data sets were put together in a matrix format, 25 cells of data would be needed.

Another concrete suggestion was that NCES utilize "shuttle forms" when requesting similar data year after year. Thus the respondents' answers from the previous reporting period would be entered on the form the respondent was being asked to fill. This would have the advantage of ensuring that the same definitions were used over time and it would make it easier for the respondent to provide more nearly accurate data in the subsequent periods. The group specifically recommended that NCES do a structural analysis of all HEGIS forms to determine if by reformatting or by other means the data burden could be reduced.

Agenda Item 11

The final item discussed by the group was the use of general statistical data for administrative purposes. A great deal of the information collected by various elements of the Education Division are quite similar. The problems frequently lie in minor differences in definition or in the timeliness of the data. It's a very real problem for institutions to provide a set of data for HEGIS and then have to supply essentially the same data at a slightly different time for applications or for other administrative purposes. The recommendation was made that it might be possible for the institutions simply to attach a copy of their most recent HEGIS submission as part of an application or other administrative report where the appropriate data were contained in the HEGIS document. It was pointed out that frequently the differences in definition are mandated by the Congress. The discussion then moved to the development of standardized definitions and development of a glossary. It was felt that the Congress as well as users would find the use of such standard definitions helpful.

The groups therefore made two specific recommendations: (1) that the Assistant Secretary for Education be asked to conduct a study to examine the possibility of using HEGIS reports as the core for applications and other administrative records as appropriate, and (2) that the Assistant Secretary for Education be asked to conduct a study leading toward a set of common definitions that could be used both for statistical and for administrative purposes.

General Recommendations

Two other recommendations were made outside of the agenda items. The first was that NCES should provide draft HEGIS forms to the institutions as early as possible prior to the development of the looseleaf training manual. The second recommendation was that NCES should be asked to specifically report on the status of all of the recommendations made at this postsecondary conference at the next annual conference.

Summary of Recommendations

1. NCES should conduct a user survey to determine quantitatively what benefits derive from each item on their postsecondary surveys.

2. NCES should conduct a trend analysis for all HEGIS items to determine the amount of year-to-year change which could be expected.

3. NCES should examine the possibility of fully or partially reimbursing voluntary respondents to their surveys.

4. NCES, working with the institutions, should develop a common core information set.

5. NCES should provide or facilitate the provision of

technical assistance to the institutions particularly to establish the "common core."

6. NCES should do a structural analysis of all HEGIS forms to determine ways in which the data burden could be reduced.

7. NCES should develop a looseleaf training manual for the HEGIS program. This multi-year document would explain specifically what data were being collected, in what year, and the uses to which each data item would be put.

8. The Assistant Secretary for Education should be asked to conduct a study to examine the possibility of using HEGIS forms as the core for applications and other administrative records as appropriate.

9. The Assistant Secretary for Education should be asked to develop a common set of definitions and a glossary of terms used both programmatically and statistically within the Education Division.

10. Pending the development of a looseleaf training manual, NCES should provide draft HEGIS forms at the earliest possible date to the institutions who will be providing the data.

11. NCES should specifically report on the status of all the recommendations made at this postsecondary conference at the next annual conference.

Seminar Participants

Mr. George Hall, Chairperson
Dr. Chester Neudling, Seminar Specialist

Ms. Joan Brackett
Mr. James Brady
Dr. O. Jean Brandes
Mr. David Caywood
Dr. J. Douglas Conner
Mr. Sal Corrallo
Mr. Theodore H. Drews
Ms. Maryse Eymonerie
Dr. James W. Firnberg

Dr. William S. Graybeal
Dr. Roger K. Hanson
Dr. John F. Harvey
Ms. Barbara Hitchcock
Mr. Roger Hummel
Mr. George Lind
Mr. Thomas McFee
Dr. Joseph Teresa
Mr. Charles R. Thomas
Mr. George H. Wade
Mr. Lloyd Wagner
Mr. Paul Wing

REPORT OF SEMINAR GROUP III

"The issues of student access, choice, and retention."

The question of measuring or quantifying information concerning access, choice, and retention, especially as they relate to special groups of people, is far from resolution. However, the extending of equal opportunities for a postsecondary education is a current issue of striking importance.

The meeting began with a description of the kinds of information that NCES is now collecting relative to student access, choice and retention. Besides longitudinal data, what other types of data is NCES collecting either from institutions or other sources that would be descriptive of the students entering postsecondary education and, where entering, are there are any materials on retention?

NCES has not been following through on individual students, but they are just now doing a study on access to certain professions -- medicine, dentistry, law, etc. -- and have data on enrollment for advanced degrees. NCES has approached medical associations, for example, and received data on applications and on access, thereby obtaining data on a broad base (but not by individual students) as to number of applications, people accepted, people enrolled, and number receiving degrees.

The Bureau of Postsecondary Education now has data on income, other characteristics and sex for finanical recipients (student aid).

The Office for Civil Rights has collected National data biennially concerning the race/ethnicity and sex of students enrolled, by level, by year, and by selected fields of study. On a local or institutional basis the Office for Civil Rights also collects other information related to investigations of discrimination complaints and remedies for findings of discrimination, such as employment, promotion, student retention, financial assistance, and student applicant flow.

Need for Additional Data

The question was also raised as to whether NCES needs to collect any more data to determine the issues of access, choice and retention, or is the problem one of taking existing data and putting them in a different perspective to try to address some of the basic issues, as follows:

- What are the forces that work to determine the student's going on to college?
- What are the forces determining whether anybody might continue his education and at what point in time are those decisions made?
- What are some of the reasons why some people never finish college?
- What kind of statistical data are needed to inform policy-makers and how are they to be structured and managed?

It was pointed out that policy-makers are making informed decisions and should not be making decisions in a vacuum. The Federal Government needs measures to see why we are or are not getting what is required; significant funds are being expended in this particular area. The data are also needed because of their relationship to Equal Employment Opportunity.

The point was made that in looking at income characteristics of students, it is very useful and helpful not to mislead people in terms of student aid programs, the problem is how rigidly one is able to enforce some of these definitions. We should separate dependent and independent students into two categories as far as earned income levels for purposes of the student aid program.

Further discussion ensued as to the classification of dependent and independent students separately so as to determine about the definition of students who finance themselves ("independent") and those who are dependent upon their family's income.

The Residence and Migration Survey was mentioned as a source of student access data but concern was expressed that the Survey was not satisfactory as currently conducted because of changes in definition. It was recommended that coverage on this Survey be limited to entering students.

Regarding more data collection from NCES, the Office of Education and the Office of Civil Rights, it was noted that NCES does cooperate with Census with some survey items, for example, the Adult Education Study as part of the CPS, to which NCES has contributed some funds.

It was stated that there was no available information about people who do not go to college; the whole access and retention picture might look different from a lifelong perspective. With the forthcoming new cohort of the National Longitudinal Study, NCES is looking into the possibility of collecting information on dropouts.

It was suggested that educators should be aiming at developing some parity in Educational Opportunity based upon college entry, choice, type of institution, ability, retention and college completion determined by the individual and not by the institution. All of this discussion about "college" prompted the remark that attendance by youth at accredited colleges apparently is being considered the ultimate goal. The issues of access to other education as well as collegiate education are the same; what is good and what is not good -- there is a value system inherent in all of this. What about those who postpone their education? When in his lifetime is it appropriate for an individual not to participate in an educational activity? We must expand the parameters concerning the universes we deal with and collect data on all "students".

Therefore, we must find a way to get comparable data from all areas of postsecondary education -- business, labor, churches, governmental, proprietary schools, vocational schools; such as, apprenticeship, labor, etc. The NLS is attempting to do this by asking respondents to name the postsecondary school being attended or that had been attended.

Near-term demographics should be analyzed. In the next four years, the number of traditional students will begin to decline, so we will be concentrating on getting data on the minority of the population in the universities and colleges, and even postsecondary, as compared with the totality of persons in education.

"Middle Income" - What Is It?

The question was raised as to what is happening to the middle-income family and what are the implications of access with respect to the student from the middle-income family. It was stated that statistics are useful in general categories but will not answer the question at the grass roots level in terms of both access and choice. Are these problems real or imagined?

Are middle-income persons being squeezed out of access to some institution? The real problem is, "What is middle income?" Middle income was postulated at $12,000 with children who want to go to college. Do more of these students go to college than those in families with income below $7,000 or $8,000?

The question was posed as to who in the middle-income group is still restricted in access to college? Much discussion ensued, and it was generally concluded that we must seek to answer the broader policy question: Is access still an issue for most groups within the society or is it now one of choice? We may need to collect more data to answer this question, but there are so many variables involved that we are dealing with a complex research project rather than a data collection problem.

Longitudinal Studies

There was more discussion on preference of school and access and income and access. It was stated that income does appear to be a determinant of access and choice. More economic data or income data are needed in order to provide the possibility of better analysis and better policy decisions. NCES can improve its collection of information by collaborating with Census to get more pertinent data, because data are collected from families and individuals in the Census sample. The National Longitudinal Study also yields pertinent data and there was consensus that this activity be carried forward.

A lengthy discussion ensued concerning the GED or high school equivalency test given in lieu of a high school diploma. There was general lack of definite information as to whether or not GED data are or are not included with high school graduates. There was no knowledge of GED's conferred by the military. If access if to be studied in depth, we need to know the pool eligible to be drawn upon and GED data is one of the incremental items.

Choice

The group now turned to the problem of CHOICE and the discussion immediately focused upon the definition of this concept. There was much confusion as to the basic measurable items needed to provide insight into this issue. Among those mentioned were:

1. Income of student;
2. Admissions practices and policies;
3. Available financial aid;
4. Program offerings and type of institution;
5. Abilities;
6. High school records; and
7. Motivations - to name a few.

Socioeconomic factors bulk large in the problem of choice. There also seems to be a high correlation between choice and retention.

Retention

The mention of the term "retention" focused attention on that area at this point. There was general agreement that longitudinal studies are required in this area. Intentions and attitudes can be measured at one point in time and later the same panel can be investigated to discover what really happened.

The major difficulty that seemed to pervade the discussion of retention was that of pinpointing a definition of the term and then identifying quantifiable measures for evaluation. Is retention defined in terms of the completion of an educational milestone -- an undergraduate degree, a graduate degree, or a career goal? What is meant by "success"? Perhaps it would be more useful to ask what each person intends to achieve and to find out later what they actually achieve. Also, if there is a change, in what direction? In effect, we are talking about long-term longitudinal studies.

Recommendations

1. There was general agreement that what is needed, first of all, is the development of a generally accepted glossary of standardized terms, especially in the area of student access, choice and retention before data are collected.

2. It was recommended that NCES convene all possible representation from State departments of Higher Education to begin work as soon as possible on the problem of data reduction and common data elements. More effective data linkage between States and the Federal Government should be instituted.

3. It was recommended that a study is needed of high school students going to college and getting through. What are the characteristics of students who obtained the degrees reported in the Earned Degrees Survey? How many part-time students make it through to a major? Can we obtain an overall profile of degree recipients on a sampling basis periodically?

4. State initiative is required, as well as greater coordination between NCES and the States in the development of retention indices.

5. Access, choice, and retention should be conceptualized in a lifelong framework. Studies should provide an overview of a broad spectrum of activities and not be limited to accredited institutions of higher education.

6. It was generally recommended that data be collected on higher continuing education, both credit and noncredit.

7. In the current National Longitudinal Survey, postsecondary graduates should be compared with persons who had no postsecondary education in terms of lifestyle, job satisfaction, and other attitudes and not merely on the basis of income.

8. In this connection, States that prefer should be given an opportunity to increment their portion of the longitudinal sample in order to produce a valid State sample. Adequate time should be provided to allow interested States to avail themselves of this approach.

9. In future longitudinal studies, panel members should be followed as long as benefit accrues with respect to costs.

10. It was recommended that NCES provide a vehicle for ultra-rapid surveys when deviations from normal patterns have been detected in order to test for changes and the results distributed at large.

11. With respect to the Seminar itself, it was recommended that a more structured approach could have been taken had there been a presentation, by an expert, of a paper addressing itself to the major problems in each of the areas of student access, choice and retention.

Seminar Participants

Ms. Lois Rice, Chairperson
Mr. Joel Williams, Seminar Specialist

Mr. Elmer Collins
Mr. Ted S. Cooper
Mr. Robert F. Herrick
Ms. Patricia Hobson
Dr. Edith M. Huddleston
Ms. Florence Kemp
Ms. Paula Keubler
Mr. Norman Kurland
Dr. Carl A. Lindsay
Mr. Howell McGee
Mr. Bruce Robertson
Dr. Oscar Rogers
Dr. Leslie W. Ross
Mr. G. Emerson Tully
Dr. Kenneth E. Young

REPORT OF SEMINAR GROUP IV

"The issues and future of planning and coordinating postsecondary programs at the State level."

States are moving toward increased coordination, support, and thus to increasing governance of postsecondary education. This growth of State activity represents a change in the condition of education; and it becomes a responsibility of NCES to investigate the State's educational roles.

Group IV's specific charge was that it "develop guidelines and comment on a program of data acquisition that will quantify the State educational roles, permitting analysis of the State function and program, and permitting inter-State comparisons and National aggregations of the educational operations of the States."

According to NCES' staff, Group IV's charge was the only one which had not been covered by previous conferences. Because of the newness of the subject matter area, the group spent a considerable amount of time developing a focus or set of foci for discussion, analysis, and recommendations.

Throughout the early discussions regarding NCES' involvement in state-level data acquisition, several significant concerns emerged. First and foremost appeared to be the basic question of whether NCES should be involved at all in data collection about state-level activities. Second, concern was expressed that compilation of data by States will often lead to invidious and invalid comparisons about which State is doing the most or the least with regard to a given aspect of postsecondary education. Third, concern was expressed about NCES' undertaking an anticipatory role in data collection about States, because of its potential for interfering with the freedom of individual States to deal with their own special or unique problems in their own ways.

At the outset, five issues were suggested as significant issues if NCES were to involve itself in State data acquisition: 1) the need for common definitions; 2) decisions regarding the use of sampling techniques versus universe data; 3) articulation of the purpose of the data; 4) decisions regarding frequency of data series; and 5) development of screening mechanisms for eliminating unnecessary data requests.

In the final analysis, the group decided to recommend that NCES play only a limited role in the acquisition of basic data about States. As a consequence of this basic decision, the group decided to recommend that NCES collect data which would permit inter-state comparisons in some areas such as finances (income and expenditures), and projected enrollments. Some members of the group urged that States make information available to each other upon request without the intervention of the Federal Government.

As a second consequence of that basic decision, the group agreed to recommend that NCES should not, at this time, seek to acquire data solely for the purpose of clarifying State educational roles or permitting analysis of State functions and programs. The group felt that this data acquisition would be more appropriately the function of some other agency than NCES.

On the other hand, it was felt that when NCES had data which was generalizable at the State level or below, it could aid greatly by providing data which was deemed significant on a State basis, as well as on a National basis. When data are collected by means of a National sample, the sample should be drawn in such a manner that State data as well as National data can be made available.

The group's third recommendation is that NCES and the Education Commission of the States confer and jointly agree on who should publish that catalog or directory type of information about State agencies, institutions, and programs which are not now being published by either organization.

Finally, the group strongly supports NCES' efforts to assist the States in their planning activities through such contracts as the Coordination with the States project to develop an information network between the States and NCES and among the States. The group also endorses the effort to expand the NCHEMS State-Level Information Base project (SLIB) through a contract to: 1) evaluate the use of Federally-collected data for State needs; 2) expand the number of States in which the SLIB will be tested; and 3) provide additional funds for training State personnel in the use of SLIB.

Seminar Participants

Mr. Chalmers G. Norris, Chairperson
Dr. Robert J. Pitchell, Seminar Specialist

Mr. Curtis O. Baker
Dr. Francis Corrigan
Ms. Sheila Drews
Dr. Steve Hample
Dr. H. Joanne Harrar
Mr. Donald Hess, Jr.
Dr. Ivan Lach
Dr. Beverly Lynch
Mr. H. Gilbert Nicol
Dr. Roger Norden
Dr. Richard J. Peterso
Mr. Byrl R. Shoemaker

REPORT OF SEMINAR GROUP V

> "The development and consolidation of programs of assistance to the States and the structure and mechanism for the consolidated priorities."

In accordance with the Education Amendments of 1974, NCES is "tooling up" to provide technical and financial assistance to State and local education agencies and institutions. The major problem, however, revolves about the amount of funding available to NCES so that this program of assistance to the States will, in all likelihood, have to compete for priority among all other programs of the Center.

The discussion focused on the impact of the Educational Amendments of 1974, which mandate that NCES provide technical assistance to the States and individual postsecondary educational institutions so as to provide them with better data and the ability to analyze it in a meaningful way for their own needs. No additional funds are provided for this purpose, so that other NCES activities may have to be reduced in order to comply with the amendments; thus, a reordering of NCES priorities is indicated. It is hoped that recommendations for any required priority changes will result from this seminar. Any recommendations should be consistent with the broad goal of reducing the response burden on reporting agencies.

In the past NCES has provided technical assistance primarily through development of standard terminology designed to benefit the States and other users. Now, however, NCES should go further and assist the users to implement these efforts by providing them with other techniques and analyses which will be broadly disseminated to States and institutions. The assistance must be provided to all postsecondary institutions -- that is, it must encompass institutions other than solely the traditional "higher education" group.

Various methods of achieving these goals and the attendant problems were suggested and discussed. No specific recommendations were unanimously and enthusiastically endorsed, but a few tentative directions were suggested which received essential agreement. Realistic recommendations by the group for reordering NCES priorities vis-a-vis existing activities were not considered possible because of the many and varied pressures on NCES, of which the participants were not aware and thus could not evaluate.

Topics Addressed

A. Data Requirements and Comparability: Federal/State/Institutional

Discussion Highlights

Federal and State Data requirements tend to overlap and are reported in different formats and use different definitions. There is a mutuality of these requirements, and it is possible to delineate a common core of data needs. The definitional problems in doing so are illustrated by the difficulty in even determining State financial assistance to Postsecondary Education (PSE). Does this include the support of teaching hospitals in one State and not another? If so, comparability is lost. Agreement is needed on a basic set of definitions, including what is and is not included in the term "higher education."

It will be necessary to get all States and NCES to adopt the same definitions for the Core data elements used for PSE reporting purposes. It will also be necessary to train institutional respondents in the definitions, and monitor reporting carefully to assure that definitions are applied.

The involvement of the States will be necessary in the review of reports to assure comparability increased by working with NCES with the goal of improving comparability. Institutional data would still be the base, but would be coordinated through the States. This procedure would result in decreasing institutional reporting burdens where States can use the Federal definition for State reports. In some States legal or accounting requirements will not allow the State to use the Federal definition for State purposes.

At the present time the NCHEMS State Level Information Base (SLIB) study appears to be the best hope for resolving comparability and definitional problems. Common core data elements will be specified by this effort which is oriented toward planning, not budget preparation. The study is being made using an iterative process involving representatives of all users -- Federal, State and institutional. Although this process is scheduled to take about three years for completion, some field testing will be complete by next year. The core of common Federal and State requirements will be defined, and the number of States testing the systems are planned to be expanded beyond the present five.

B. Possibilities of More Analytical Work by NCES to Benefit States and Instutitions

Discussion Highlights

More use of NCES data for policy and analysis would identify gaps and respondent errors, and would be of more direct help in improving data for both State and Federal purposes. If data aren't used, data limitations will never be identified. An example was cited of the additional value enrollment projections would have if broken down by State rather than only nationally, as is the present practice. The answer was that present NCES methodology does not permit this kind of extension of the enrollment analysis. States can use the data to make their own analysis, to suit their own needs, and some States already are doing so. It was suggested that NCES set up a network of communication between the States so that the efforts of one State in this kind of analysis can be made available to others, not only in enrollment analysis, but in extension of analyses of other published NCES data as well.

It was also pointed out that NCES sometimes is able to undertake ad hoc analyses of data on request, for State agencies or individual institutions.

C. How Valuable are HEGIS Data to the States?

Discussion Highlights

Recent statements by representatives of the State of New York, to the effect that relatively little HEGIS data are of value to them, have been given too much weight by NCES and others. New York represents a special situation because of the unique power of its Board of Regents; the other 49 States should be queried as to how they feel about the usefulness of the HEGIS data in their operations. A different picture of potential value could well result.

Conclusions and Recommendations

1. The participants were not in a position to revise the priorities of HEGIS efforts. NCES will have to accommodate the new mandates of the Education Amendments of 1974 to the extent that they can within the framework of the resources and the requirements. Information regarding the many variables and pressures on NCES wasn't supplied to the group. The group thought the technical assistance to the states mandates were important, but were not able to say what reductions should be made in other NCES programs to accommodate technical assistance.

2. It is recommended that NCES attempt to increase the involvement of the States in the reporting process. Goals would be to ease the reporting burdens of the institutions and to merge State and Federal data requirements, minimizing inconsistencies.

In addition, NCES should extend its analyses, and its assistance to the States in conducting their analyses, to show the ways in which HEGIS data can be useful and the areas where it needs improvement.

3. NCES should continue to support the NCHEMS State Level Information Base study to attempt to achieve definitional and comparability agreement by the States and NCES. Similar studies in other areas of interest within PSE also should be continued and supported.

4. Finally, it is recommended that NCES undertake to establish a mechanism for insuring that the various States know what their

counterparts are doing with regard to extension of analyses of HEGIS data reports for intrastate use. Such a mechanism might be through meetings, publications, or a variety of techniques, and need not require major expenditures to accomplish.

Seminar Participants

Dr. John Folger, Chairperson
Mr. Roger Taylor, Seminar Specialist

Dr. Frank C. Abbott
Mr. Thomas Braun
Dr. James Doi
Dr. William Dorfman
Mr. D. Francis Finn
Mr. Norman Fischer
Mr. Charles Griffith
Dr. Lyle Lanier
Mr. John Lorenz
Mr. Bernard Michael
Mr. Francis Nassetta
Dr. David Orr
Dr. Joe Saupe
Dr. Frank Schick
Dr. Stanley Smith
Dr. Jacob Stampen
Ms. Ruth Tangman

REPORT OF SEMINAR GROUP VI

"Postsecondary issues and concerns for 1985 and related data needs."

The purpose of this Seminar was to update the issues identification and priority-setting work previously done to develop the postsecondary common core of data and to plan the next steps for the NCES postsecondary data core development.

The data needs of those who manage postsecondary institutions, of policy analysts, and of Federal and State policy-makers sometimes appear inexhaustible particularly in the context of limited NCES resources for meeting those needs. The purpose of Seminar VI was to bring together representatives of these various sectors and staff of NCES to address the question of setting priorities for data collection over the next decade. This task was to be undertaken in the context of an assessment of the substantive issues in postsecondary education which are likely to emerge over the next decade, attempting to identify high priority data needs emerging from those issues. Background materials 1/ used in the Seminar provided substantial delimeation of identified policy issues. It was hoped that the outcomes of Seminar VI would help the Center to move towards developing a set of relevant data elements to address policy issues in the 1980"s.

The discussion by the group focused on four major questions:

1. What will be the pressing issues in 1985? What data will be needed to help analysts and policymakers address those issues?
2. What data are presently available, and what are not available either from NCES or elsewhere?
3. Over the next decade, what role in data collection/verification/analysis, etc., is NCES to play?

4. What trade-offs can NCES make to reduce respondent burden and to provide the information needed to address policy issues? That is, within resource constraints, how can NCES meet newly developing needs?

As a starting point, the group reviewed the major issues, issue dimensions, and needed data categories identified in the resource materials. Major issues which are clearly of concern now and were expected to remain important or even increase in importance over the next decade were:

1. The extent to which society provides equal educational access to a wide range of institutions and programs dependent primarily upon the interests, needs and abilities of individuals rather than upon their race, sex, or income;
2. The extent to which postsecondary education meets, exceeds, or falls short of the manpower requirements of the economy in specific knowledge and skill areas;
3. The problems of more effectively relating education to career preparation and experience and to the learning needs of the individual over the entire life span (recurrent education);
4. The continuing emergence of new types of students and new programs to meet their needs and the need for society to encourage such experimentation;
5. The extent and contribution of research, particularly that performed by postsecondary institutions.

In addition to these major issue areas, discussions touched upon a number of other questions or issues which they identified as growing in importance and which imply needs for data which may not be collected today:

1. The continuing need to identify, categorize and document the substantive outcomes of education and to relate those outcomes to costs;

2. The impact of increasing mobility of students (in and out of student status, among institutions, changing of majors, etc.) on students and on institutions;
3. The increasing sensitivity of enrollment fluctuations to the state of the economy and its impact on students and institutions;
4. The role and impact of proprietary institutions;
5. The emergency of concerns regarding the costs, effectiveness and appropriate role of community colleges;
6. The impact of an increasingly less clear distinction between the public and private sectors of postsecondary education and ensuing questions of funding, shared facilities and overlap.

Data needs relating to each of the issues were suggested to NCES staff in the course of the discussion of these issues. The focus then shifted to questions of the role envisioned for NCES vis-a-vis future issues and priorities. The discussion concluded with the recommendation that to meet current and future data needs in education, NCES should play a broader role:

> Recommendation 1: NCES should become a central resource which provides education policy-makers and analysts with access to all education and education-related data, whether directly collected by NCES or not.

The group envisioned NCES expanding beyond its current data collection role to become a coordinator and assembly and dispersal point for educational data. Researchers and analysts should be able to find at NCES a cataloguing of appropriate and related data collected by other agencies such as Bureau of the Census, Bureau of Labor Statistics, etc. In implementing this recommendation, NCES could further take an active role with respect to the data of other agencies and provide analyses of its validity for education purposes and its relationship to data collected by NCES. Even further, NCES could act as a "library" of such data by establishing an inventory of the tapes themselves.

As a first step toward developing this kind of role, it was suggested that NCES expand the familiarity staff has with the activities of other agencies:

> Recommendation 2: NCES should establish viable linkages with other data collection agencies in order to further develop its capabilities for data acquisition.

It was stressed that data collection is only one of NCES' functions. Further discussion of NCES focused on its leadership role in the area of establishing statistical standards and definitions for data collection elements, providing technical assistance to the States, and analyzing data so that the information can be used in decision-making as well as serving as a national reference center.

The discussion of issues highlighted another problem for NCES: how to remain current and consistent yet be able to provide timely data regarding newly emerging and unforeseen policy issues. The group conceptualized the data collection activities of NCES as falling in three categories: collection of core data, the performance of selected longitudinal studies aimed at illuminating important processes, and conducting "quick studies intended to provide insight into important topical issues."

> Recommendation 3: The highest priority for NCES in data collection on postsecondary education should be to establish a general cross-sectional data core for students and institutions which provides basic "indicator" data about postsecondary education in this country.

This data core provides a necessary description of postsecondary education which will be common to whatever policy issues are likely to be discussed in future decades. Data matrices for students and for institutions should be developed so that the data can be related to each other through cross-walks. Data such as the following should be included in this core effort:

- Institutional Data
  - status (existence, control, governance)
- Student Data
  - income/finance
  - ability (selectivity)
  - enrollment (part-time, full-time, transfer)
  - curricula
- Inputs
  - income
  - expenditures (dollars, characteristics of faculty, facilities, libraries, etc.)
- Outputs
  - degrees, credit hours
  - course completions (diplomas, certificates)

The general data core should strive for breadth and consistency so that trends and projections could be plotted. It was emphasized, however, that consistent definitions rather than breadth were crucial for using the data to establish trends. It was also noted that if the data are not located in one source, then other sources should be located and tapped by NCES. Furthermore, NCES (as suggested above) should ensure that whatever data from other sources are included are both sound and comparable. The National Longitudinal Study was cited as an example in which data on financial aid was incomplete (since students did not reliably know the source of the aid) and must be supplemented with other data.

The actual development of the postsecondary education data core will involve issue identification and priority setting, specification of the information needs of many institutions, and judgements on the relative importance of different data elements. The question of setting these priorities will be discussed later.

The group agreed that a basic cross-sectional data core was only one component of needed data. There was also a vital need for longitudinal studies to accommodate changing ideas and to document changing patterns:

> Recommendation 4: NCES should develop a carefully considered plan for the support of targeted longitudinal studies of the educational activities and characteristics of select groups.

Longitudinal studies now underway are proving invaluable to analysts and policy-makers in understanding newly emerging trends and in analyzing process variables. Further planning efforts of NCES should focus in part on developing, with outside consultation, a long-range plan for further longitudinal studies of specific target groups.

In its attempt to anticipate future issues, the group concluded that current data do provide clues to understanding emerging issues but that there will always be unforeseen or unanticipated events. It was noted that as issues shift and change, so do the underlying assumptions we have about education, and with them, our judgements about the most useful data to collect. To deal with the fact that the future cannot be known until it becomes the present, the group suggests that NCES consider the following:

> Recommendation 5: As a complement to the core data collection efforts and to targeted longitudinal studies, NCES should develop the capacity to engage in data collection efforts which would provide "quick snapshot" views of issues of high current interest.

The purpose of such studies would be to provide a broad rather than detailed understanding of the issues. The emphasis would be on timeliness and some reasonable (though not excessive) level of reliability. To keep these efforts trim and quick, sampling should be used and non-traditional means of data collection (such as opinion surveys, the Delphi technique, etc.) should be considered.

In summary, the group saw a broadened role for NCES, first in becoming a more active coordinator and library of statistics from whatever source, and, secondly, in expanding longitudinal studies and engaging in quick efforts intended to illuminate newly emerging issues. Finally, the basic core data collection on postsecondary education needs to be carefully reviewed and restructured both to eliminate unnecessary effort and to increase the value of what is collected.

Finally, the group addressed the question of setting priorities and, given the recommendations for expanded efforts, the problem of cutting back on current efforts to accommodate them. The basic recommendation of the group on this question was:

> Recommendation 6: NCES is strongly urged to undertake substantive planning, evaluation, and management of its efforts in order to ensure that within constrained resources that data is collected which is most critically needed by policy-makers.

Planning by NCES needs to be issue-oriented. That is, the follow-on effort of translating the work done in Federal Policy

Issues and Data Needs in Postsecondary Education to actual data to be collected needs to be undertaken. During the course of the workshop, the group began the process of dealing with the one issue concerned with access. That exercise produced some consensus of judgement on the data proposed in the report which should and should not be collected. Two things were clear from the exercise. First, it was apparent that translating issue identification into operational statements concerning which data to collect is a difficult and complex process but one which needs to be undertaken by NCES. Secondly, while various "constituency" groups should clearly be involved in the process, in the end value judgements will have to be made by NCES as to what data to collect, how often and through what mechanism. An outside group can (and indeed should) assist in that process but NCES must have final responsibility.

Planning by NCES should also involve some analysis of current and potential utilization of data. Who actually uses the data which are currently collected? Who will use data that are being considered for collection? For what purposes are data used or will be used? Is the value of such use worth the cost of collection? Upon whom should the cost burden lie?

Further, an analysis is needed of the generators of the data which is collected. What are the costs to the generators? Are the data of adequate value to the generators? Should they be compensated for the costs of data collection?

Through such analysis, NCES will be in a position to address another concern of the group:

Recommendation 7: NCES should review and define

> more carefully the relative roles in data generation, collection, and utilization of the Federal and State governments and institutions in order to more effectively and fairly structure the total data process.

It is conceivable that data which NCES now collects are of use only to States or institutions and should be collected, analyzed and published by States (or regional consortia, etc.). It is also possible that data which are of use only at the Federal level should be collected directly by the Federal agency, probably on a sample basis. The discussion could not include kinds of information and analysis proposed above which would be needed to reach conclusions on these issues. It was agreed, however, that questions such as these need to be addressed. In general, it was felt, for example, that NCES should concentrate on general purpose statistics that describe the major trends in education; whereas data which serve the management and decision-making needs of States and institutions might more appropriately be collected by those agencies. In any event, data collection roles should be determined through an analysis of the usage of the data.

This planning effort needs to be coordinated with other agencies, particularly within DHEW:

> Recommendation 8: The Education Division of DHEW should analyze the functions of NCES and the National Institute of Education (NIE) with regard to the collection of general statistics versus those that are needed to answer specific research questions, with the intention of evolving a plan for the efforts of each agency.

Many policy questions involve both data collection and directed research in order to gain the most fruitful insights. The work of the two agencies needs to be coordinated more carefully for those issues where duplication or overlap is most likely.

As a final observation, the group was in agreement that the documents reviewed and its own work was only a start on a process of analyzing, evaluating and rationalizing the total program of NCES. That effort is critical in the face of a combination of newly emerging needs for data along with a relatively tight resource picture. Undertaking it should be a high priority for NCES.

Seminar Participants

Mr. Michael O'Keefe, Chairperson
Dr. Vladimir Dupre, Seminar Specialist

Dr. Robert C. Andringa
Dr. Kate Arbogast
Dr. George Arnstein
Dr. Frederick Balderston
Dr. Margerie O. Chandler
Ms. Pamela Christoffel
Dr. Cleveland Dennard
Dr. Russell Edgerton
Ms. Marie Eldridge
Mr. Joseph Froomkin
Ms. Iris Garfield
Ms. Cathy Henderson
Dr. Warren Hill
Mr. Dennis P. Jones
Ms. Evelyn Kay
Dr. Martin A. Kramer
Mr. Paul Mertins
Dr. Susan Nelson
Dr. George Nolfi
Mr. David Nyman
Ms. Shirley Radcliffe
Dr. Lewis Solmon
Ms. Katherine Wallman

1/ Christoffel and Rice, Federal Policy Issues and Data Needs In Postsecondary Education, NCES, 1975; excerpts from Financing Postsecondary Education in the United States, The National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education, 1973; Data and Decision-Making in Postsecondary Education, report of the Newman Task Force, 1973.

IV. SUMMARY

We have studied the reports of the Seminar Group sessions in an effort to discover some common threads that run through them and establish a consensus of opinion. The following comments, which do not represent complete consensus, nevertheless indicate concepts, issues, and problems of a similar nature independently arrived at in these sessions:

1. There is a serious lack of standard and compatible definitions and terminology across the spectrum of postsecondary education. NCES should develop a common core of data elements that have a high degree of utilization by both respondents and users.
2. The crucial focus of the study on the impact of postsecondary education is the student and his goals rather than the institution. The longitudinal study can be very effective in this connection.
3. NCES should fully or at least partially reimburse survey respondents for the data provided as well as provide technical assistance to its respondents, States and other users of the data.
4. NCES should use the "quick survey" technique to rapidly identify changing patterns. It should anticipate emerging needs rather than follow an ex post facto reactive role.
5. Data should be made relevant to educational data collected by other Federal agencies, such

as the Census Bureau, the Labor Department, the National Science Foundation, etc.

6. NCES should take a close look at data bases now available in order to determine whether or not these are sufficient, or the problem is one of reorganization and analysis of already available data.

The statements above represent broad issues or problems stated or implied in the course of more than one seminar group session. Of course, many other specific recommendations are contained within the notes of each of the group sessions that were particularly pertinent to the problems being discussed by that group. In order to obtain the full flavor of this Conference, it is necessary that the reader carefully examine all the reports, especially within the context of the title and thematic introduction to each of the sessions.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Seminar Participants

Dr. Frank C. Abbott
Executive Director
Colorado Commission on
Higher Education
1000 State Social Services Bldg.
Denver, Colorado 80203

Dr. Robert C. Andringa
Minority Staff Director
Education and Labor Committee
U.S. House of Representatives
2179 Rayburn Building
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dr. Kate Arbogast
Economist
Office of Regulatory Review
Department of Health,
Education and Welfare
3rd and Independence, S.W.
Room 310-G, South Portal
Washington, D.C. 20201

Dr. George Arnstein
Director
National Advisory Council on
Education Professions Development
1111 20th Street, N.W.
Room 306
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mr. Curtis O. Baker
ASE/NCES/DSPA/HESB
Department of Health,
Education and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 2171
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dr. Frederick Balderston
Chairman
Center for Research in
Management Science
26 Barrows Hall
University of California
Berkeley, California 94720

Mr. Richard M. Beazley
ASE/NCES/DSPA/HESB
Department of Health,
Education and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 2171
Washington, D.C. 20202

Ms. Caroline Bird (Speaker)
Author
c/o Harry L. Walker Agency
350 Fifth Avenue
New York, N. Y. 10001

Mr. Clark Bouwman
Director
Association for Innovation in
Higher Education
Eckerd College
P. O. Box 12560
St. Petersburg, Florida 33733

Ms. Joan Brackett
Equal Opportunity Specialist
Office for Civil Rights
Department of Health, Education
and Welfare
330 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Room 1271-F
Washington, D.C. 20201

Mr. James Brady
Chief
Bureau of Statistical Services
New York State Education Department
Room 563
Education Building Annex
Albany, New York 12234

Dr. O. Jean Brandes
ASE/NCES
Department of Health, Education
and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 3061
Washington, D.C. 20202

Mr. Thomas Braun
Coordinator
Information and Data Systems
Council on Public Higher
Education
Commonwealth of Kentucky
Capital Plaza Office Tower
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

Dr. Robert Calvert
ASE/NCES/DSPA/AVSB
Department of Health,
Education and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 2175
Washington, D.C. 20202

Mr. David Caywood
Associate Clearance Officer
Office of Management and Budget
726 Jackson Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20503

Dr. Marjorie O. Chandler
Director
Division of Statistical Information
ASE/NCES/DIS/OD
Department of Health,
Education and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 3073
Washington, D.C. 20202

Ms. Pamela Christoffel
Consultant
College Entrance Examination Board
1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Suite 404
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mr. Elmer Collins
ASE/NCES/DSIS/SAB
Department of Health,
Education and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 3065
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dr. J. Douglas Conner
Executive Secretary
American Association of Collegiate
Registrars and Admissions Office
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Suite 330
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mr. Ted S. Cooper
Executive Director
National Association of College
Admissions Counselors
9933 Lawler Avenue
Suite 500
Skokie, Illinois 60076

Mr. Sal Corrallo
Division Director
Post Secondary and
International Programs
Office of Education
Department of Health,
Education and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 4079
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dr. Francis Corrigan
ASE/NCES/OA/NAEP
Department of Health,
Education and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 3073
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dr. Cleveland Dennard (Speaker)
President
Washington Technical Institute
4100 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20008

Dr. James Doi
Dean
College of Education
University of Rochester
Rochester, New York 14627

Dr. William Dorfman
ASE/NCES/DSIS/SSB
Department of Health,
Education and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 3059C
Washington, D.C. 20202

Ms. Sheila Drews
Educational Planning Specialist
District of Columbia Commission
On Postsecondary Education
1329 E Street, N.W.
Suite 1203
Washington, D.C. 20004

Mr. Theodore H. Drews
Acting Director
ASE/NCES/DSPA/OD
Department of Health,
Education and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 2177
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dr. Vladimir Dupre
(Seminar Specialist)
Private Consultant
8313 Loring Drive
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

Dr. Russell Edgerton
Deputy Director
Fund of the Improvement of
Postsecondary Education
Department of Health,
Education and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 3141
Washington, D.C. 20202

Ms. Marie Eldridge
Administrator
ASE/NCES/OA
Department of Health,
Education and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 3C73
Washington, D.C. 20202

Ms. Maryse Eymonerie
Associate Secretary
American Association of
University Professors
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mr. D. Francis Finn
Executive Vice President
National Association of College
& University Business Officers
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Suite 510
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dr. James W. Firnberg
Coordinator
Institutional Research
Louisiana State University System
381 Pleasant Hall
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803

Mr. Norman Fischer
State of Washington
Council for Postsecondary
Education
908 East 5th Street
Olympia, Washington 98503

Dr. John Folger
Director
Education Commission of the States
State Planning Evaluation Project
1860 Lincoln Street
Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80203

Mr. Joseph Froomkin
Joseph Froomkin, Inc.
1015 18th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Ms. Iris Garfield
Planning Officer
ASE/NCES/OA
Department of Health,
Education and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 3073B
Washington,D.C. 20202

Mr. Howard Geer
Dean
Community Services
Montgomery College
Rockville, Maryland 20850

Mr. William A. Goddard
Executive Director
National Association of Trade
and Technical Schools
2021 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dr. William S. Graybeal
Assistant Director
Research Division
National Education Association
1201 16th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mr. Charles Griffith
Bureau of Postsecondary Education
Office of Deputy Commissioner
Office of Education
Department of Health, Education
and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Mr. Lawrence Haber
ASE/NCES/DSO/OD
Department of Health, Education
and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 3073
Washington, D.C. 20202

Mr. George Hall
Chief
Social Statistics
Office of Management & Budget
New Executive Office Building
726 Jackson Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20503

Dr. Steve Hample
Staff Specialist
Maryland Council for Higher
Education
93 Main Street
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Dr. Roger K. Hanson
Chairman
College & University Libraries
Statistics Committee
7371 Sunhill Road
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah 84121

Dr. H. Joanne Harrar
Director of Libraries
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742

Dr. John F. Harvey
Dean
Library Services
Hofstra University
Hempstead, New York 11550

Ms. Cathy Henderson
Policy Analyst
American Council on Education
1 Dupont Circle, N.W.
Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mr. Robert F. Herrick
Executive Director
College Placement Council, Inc.
P. O. Box 2263
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 18001

Mr. Donald Hess, Jr.
Associate, Division of
Occupational Education Planning
New York State Education
Department
99 Washington Avenue
Room 1624, Twin Towers
Albany, New York 12230

Dr. Warren Hill
Executive Director
Education Commission of the States
700 Lincoln Tower
1860 Lincoln Street
Denver, Colorado 80203

Ms. Barbara Hitchcock
Member
Education Studies Group
Commission on Federal Paperwork
1111 20th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20582

Ms. Patricia Hobson
Special Assistant to the Associate Commissioner for Student Assistance
U.S. Office of Education
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dr. Edith M. Huddleston
ASE/NCES/DSPA/HESB
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 2171
Washington, D.C. 20202

Mr. Roger Hummel
Educational Statistics Supervisor
Pennsylvania Department of Education
P. O. Box 911
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

Rev. Jesse Jackson (Speaker)
Director
Operation PUSH
930 E. 50th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60615

Mr. Dennis P. Jones
Associate Director
NCHEMS/WICHE
P. O. Drawer "P"
Boulder, Colorado 80302

Ms. Evelyn Kay
ASE/NCES/DSPA/AVSB
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Room 2175
Washington, D.C. 20202

Ms. Florence Kemp
ASE/NCES/DSPA/AVSB
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 2166
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dr. Martin A. Kramer
Director
Higher Education Planning, ASPE
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
3rd and Independence, S.W.
Room 403-E, South Portal
Washington, D.C. 20201

Ms. Paula Kuebler
Equal Opportunity Specialist
Office for Civil Rights
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
330 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Room 1654
Washington, D.C. 20201

Mr. Norman Kurland
Director
Study of Adult Education
New York State Education Department
Room 232, Education Building
Albany, New York 12234

Dr. Ivan Lach
Associate Director
Planning and Research
Illinois Community College Board
544 Iles Park Place
Springfield, Illinois 62718

Dr. Lyle Lanier
Director
Office of Administrative Affairs
American Council on Education
1 Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mr. George Lind
ASE/NCES/DSIS/REPB
Department of Health, Education
and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 3057
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dr. Carl A. Lindsay
Head of Planning Studies
The Pennsylvania State Univ.
218 Grange Building
University Park, Penn. 16802

Mr. Felix Lindsay
Associate Study Director
Science Education Studies
Division of Science Resources
National Science Foundation
1800 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20550

Mr. John Lorenz
Executive Director
Association of Research Libraries
1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20016

Dr. Beverly Lynch
Executive Secretary
Association of College & Research
Libraries
50 East Huron Street
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Ms. Naomi McCracken
President
American Association of College
Registrars & Admissions Officers
c/o Colorado Women's College
Denver, Colorado 80220

Mr. Thomas McFee
Deputy Assistant Secretary
Management Planning and
Technical Assistance
Department of Health, Education
and Welfare
3rd and Independence, S.W.
South Portal
Washington, D.C. 20201

Dr. Howell W. McGee
Executive Vice President
Association for Continuing
Higher Education
1700 Asp Avenue
Norman, Oklahoma 73069

Mr. Paul Mertins
ASE/NCES/DSPA/HESB
Department of Health, Education
and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 2171
Washington, D.C. 20202

Mr. Bernard Michael
Executive Director
Federal Interagency Committee
on Education
Department of Health, Education
and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 3021
Washington, D.C. 20202

Mr. Francis Nassetta
Deputy Administrator
ASE/NCES/OA
Department of Health, Education
and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 3073
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dr. Susan Nelson
Research Associate
Brookings Institution
1775 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dr. Chester Neudling
(Seminar Specialist)
Waverly Farms
Route 2
Warrenton, Virginia 22816

Mr. H. Gilbert Nicol
Executive Director
Society for College and
University Planning
3 Washington Square Village
New York, New York 10012

Dr. George Nolfi
President
University Consultants, Inc.
45 Hancock Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Dr. Roger Norden
Program Specialist
Division of Institutional
Development
Bureau of Postsecondary
Education
Department of Health, Education
and Welfare
7th and D Streets, S.W.
Room 3045
Washington, D.C. 20023

Mr. Chalmers G. Norris
Director of Planning
Pennsylvania State University
405 Old Main
University Park, Penn. 16802

Mr. David Nyman
Associate Director
Data Systems
Illinois Board of Higher
Education
119 South Fifth Street
500 Reisch Building
Springfield, Illinois 62701

Ms. Linda O'Connor
Coordinator
New Jersey Department of
Higher Education
225 West State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08265

Mr. William Odom
Research and Information Systems
Division of Community Colleges
State of Florida
Department of Education
310 Collins Building
Tallahasse, Florida 32304

Mr. Michael O'Keefe
Director
Federal Relations
University of Illinois
Box 4348
2611 University Hall
Chicago, Illinois 60680

Dr. David Orr
ASE/NCES/OA
Department of Health,
Education and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 3066
Washington, D.C. 20202

Mr. John Pateros
(Seminar Specialist)
Pateros and Associates
21820 Bellsville Road
Barnesville, Maryland 20703

Dr. Richard J. Peterson
ASE/NCES/DSPA/NESB
Department of Health,
Education and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 2171
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dr. Robert J. Pitchell
(Seminar Specialist)
President
Postsecondary Education
Resources, Inc.
3134 Prosperity Avenue
Fairfax, Virginia 22030

Mr. Arthur Podolsky
ASE/NCES/DSPA/HESB
Department of Health, Education
and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 2171
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dr. John Putnam
ASE/NCES/DIS/EDSB
Department of Health, Education
and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 3031
Washington, D.C. 20202

Ms. Shirley Radcliffe
ASE/NCES/OA
Department of Health, Education
and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 3036
Washington, D.C. 20202

Ms. Lois Rice
Vice President
College Entrance Examination
Board
1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Suite 404
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mr. Bruce Robertson
Assistant Chancellor
Planning and Development
New Jersey Department of
Higher Education
225 West State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Dr. Oscar Rogers
Dean
Graduate School
Jackson State University
1510 School View Drive
Jackson, Mississippi 39213

Dr. Leslie W. Ross
Assistant Director
Division of Eligibility and
Agency Evaluation
U.S. Office of Education
Department of Health, Education
and Welfare
7th and D Streets, N.W.
Room 4068
Washington, D.C. 20023

Dr. Joe Saupe
University Director of
Institutional Research
309 University Hall
University of Missouri
Columbia, Missouri 65201

Dr. Frank Schick
ASE/NCES/DSPA/LSB
Department of Health, Education
and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue,
Room 2153
Washington, D.C. 20202

Mr. Fred Sedorchuk
Chief
Data Section
Bureau of Postsecondary Education
Office of Education
Department of Health, Education
and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Mr. Byrl R. Shoemaker
Director
Vocational Education
Department of Education
State of Ohio
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Dr. Stanley Smith
ASE/NCES/DSPA/LSB
Department of Health, Education
and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 2156
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dr. Lewis Solmon
Executive Officer
Higher Education Research Institute
924 Westwood Boulevard
Suite 850
Los Angeles, California 90024

Dr. Jacob Stampen
Senior Research Associate
Policy Analysis
American Association of State Colleges and Universities
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dr. Kenton Stephens
Special Assistant
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Education
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 3001
Washington, D.C. 20202

Ms. Ruth Tangman
Program Analyst
National Advisory Council on Vocation Education
425 13th Street, N.W.
Suite 412
Washington, D.C. 20004

Dr. Roger Taylor
(Seminar Specialist)
Director
Space Management
University of Pittsburgh
Cathedral of Learning
Room 3633
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260

Dr. Joseph Teresa
ASE/NCES/OA
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 3073
Washington, D.C. 20202

Mr. Charles R. Thomas
Executive Director
College and University Systems Exchange
737 Twenty-Ninth Street
Boulder, Colorado 80303

Mr. G. Emerson Tully
Director
Research Services
State University System of Florida
107 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Mr. George H. Wade
ASE/NCES/DSPA/HESB
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 2171
Washington, D.C. 20202

Mr. Lloyd Wagner
Director of Libraries
Catholic University of America
108 Mullen
620 Michigan Avenue, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20064

Dr. Robert Wallhaus
Deputy Director
NCHEMS/WICHE
P. O. Drawer "P"
Boulder, Colorado 80302

Ms. Katherine Wallman
Statistical Policy Division
Office of Management and Budget
726 Jackson Place, N.W.
Room 10222
Washington, D.C. 20503

Mr. Joel Williams
(Seminar Specialist)
Seminar Analyst
301 Cavalier Court
Silver Spring, Maryland 20901

Mr. Paul Wing
Coordinator for Postsecondary
  Research
Information Systems and
  Institutional Aid
New York State Education
  Department
99 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12230

Mr. Rolf Wulfsberg
ASE/NCES
Department of Health, Education
  and Welfare
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Room 3073
Washington, D.C. 20202

Dr. Kenneth E. Young
President
Council on Postsecondary
  Accreditation
1 Dupont Circle, N.W.
Suite 760
Washington, D.C. 20036

APPENDIX B

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION SEMINARS OF 1976

Airlie House, Warrenton, Virginia

June 1, 2, and 3, 1976

PRELIMINARY AGENDA

TUESDAY, JUNE 1

5:00 p.m.	Registration
6:00 p.m.	Reception (Cash Bar in The Lodge)
7:00 p.m.	Dinner
8:00 p.m.	Address: "Postsecondary Education and Its Role In Social Mobility" - Rev. Jesse Jackson FEDERAL ROOM

****

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 2

8:45 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.	Welcome - Mrs. Marie D. Eldridge, Administrator National Center for Education Statistics FEDERAL ROOM
9:00 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.	Panel: Reducing Survey Burden Mr. Thomas McFee Deputy Assistant Secretary for Management, Planning and Technology Department of Health, Education and Welfare
10:00 a.m. - 10:25 a.m.	Coffee Break
10:30 a.m. - 12:15 p.m.	Small Seminars
Group I - East Room	"Looking Toward a Single Survey for Collegiate and Noncollegiate Postsecondary Institutions; Assessing the Similarities and Differences in Data and Definitions"

Group II - Meadow Room	"The Survey Reduction Program: The Federal Reports Act; Attachment A to OMB Circular A-40; and Guidelines for Reducing Public Reporting to Federal Agencies"
Group III - Studio	"The Issues of Student Access, Choice, and Retention"
Group IV - Forge	"The Issues and Future of Planning and Coordinating Postsecondary Programs at the State Level"
Group V - Lodge	"The Development and Consolidation of Programs of Assistance to the States and the Structure and Mechanism for the Consolidated Priorities"
Group VI - Tack Room	"Postsecondary Issues and Concerns for 1985 and Related Data Needs"
12:30 p.m.	Lunch/Address: "Postsecondary Education Revisited" Dr. Cleveland Dennard, President Washington Technical Institute
1:45 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.	Small Seminars Reconvene
7:00 p.m.	Outdoor Dinner

****

THURSDAY, JUNE 3

8:45 a.m. - 10:00 a.m.	Small Groups Convene to Review Reports (Seminar Rooms)
10:00 a.m. - 10:25 a.m.	Coffee Break (served in Federal Room)
10:30 a.m. - 12:00 noon	Reports from the Small Seminars and Open Forum FEDERAL ROOM
12:30 p.m.	Lunch
1:45 p.m. - 2:45 p.m.	Open Forum FEDERAL ROOM
3:00 p.m.	Adjournment

APPENDIX C

EVALUATION FORM

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION SEMINARS OF 1976

Please complete the following before you leave the Conference.

1. Check the organization and constituency which you are representing:

A. Organization

- ☐ An institution
- ☐ A professional association
- ☐ A State education agency
- ☐ A local education agehcy
- The Federal government:
  - ☐ Executive Branch, other than NCES
  - ☐ Legislative Branch
  - ☐ NCES
  - ☐ Other (specify)________________

B. Constituency

- ☐ University
- ☐ 4-year college
- ☐ 2-year college
- ☐ Noncollegiate postsecondary schools
- ☐ Other (specify)______________

II. Use and need of NCES data

A. Check the frequency with which you use the following NCES data:

NCES Data	At least monthly	Several times a year	Twice a year	Once a year	Never
Education Directory: Colls&Univs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Postsec. Oc.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
HEGIS: Enrollment	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Degrees Conferred	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Staff	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Salary	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Financial	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Library	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Physical facilities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
National Longitudinal Study	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Postsecondary Vocational	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Adult and Continuing Education	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other (specify)____________	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

B. Check each of the uses which you make of the data cited above:

- ☐ Planning and budgeting purposes for your organization or institution
- ☐ Policy formulation for administrative purposes
- ☐ Policy formulation for legislative purposes
- ☐ Research, either ongoing or for a specific project
- ☐ As a reference
- ☐ Other (specify)______________________________

Comments:

C. In your opinion, what is the most current issue in postsecondary education?

D. What data have you needed within the past six months that did not seem to be available at the postsecondary education level?

III. Conference Evaluation

A. Check the Seminar in which you participated:

☐ I. Looking Toward a Single Survey
☐ II. Survey Reduction
☐ III. Student Access, Choice and Retention
☐ IV. Planning and Coordinating Postsecondary Programs at the State Level
☐ V. Development and Consolidation of Program Assistance to the States
☐ VI. Issues and Concerns of 1985

Were the issues discussed relevant to the topic? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If no explain

Was the discussion constructive? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If no explain

Should the topic be repeated in future conferences? ☐ Yes ☐ No

What topics would you like discussed in future conferences?

B. Which aspects of the Conference were most and least helpful?
(Check as many as you wish)

	Most helpful	Least helpful
The opportunity to know more about NCES activities	☐	☐
The opportunity to have imput into the future activities of NCES	☐	☐
The opportunity to exchange ideas and information	☐	☐
The opportunity to know more about the activities of the organizations represented at the Conference	☐	☐
Other (specify)	☐	☐

C. Please rate the following characteristics of the Conference:

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
The Conference location	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The size of the Conference	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The mix of participants	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The substance of the seminars	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The seminar approach	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The administration of the Conference	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
The handout materials	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

If an item above was rated poor, specify what would have improved the Conference:

ANALYSIS OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

I. Conference Evaluation

Conference evaluation questionnaires were distributed to all of the conferees during their stay at Airlie House. Responses were requested from everyone present, except the NCES staff members. Fifty-nine of the eighty-eight non-NCES participants completed the evaluation form. This was a response rate of sixty-seven percent.

On the whole, the responses indicate that participants were overwhelmingly well-satisfied with the Conference, although there was a definite need for improvement. The theme of the Conference should have been more focused and interwoven with the selection of speakers and the preparation of the handout materials. Several respondents indicated that more policy-makers should have been present.

Nearly three-quarters of the respondents represented the Executive Branch (other than NCES) of the Federal government, professional associations, and State education associations. Two-thirds of the respondents participated in three of the six seminars: Group II - The Survey Reduction Program; Group III - Student Access, Choice and Retention; and Group IV - Postsecondary Issues and Concerns for 1985 (see Table 1, Questions I and IIIA). Specific comments are as follows:

A. Seminars

Almost all of the respondents thought that the issues discussed in the seminars were relevant to the topic, that the discussions were constructive, and that the topics should be repeated in future Conferences (Table 2, Question IIIA). Seventy-two percent of the respondents rated the seminar approach "very good" or "excellent". Forty-seven percent of the respondents rated the substance of the seminars just as highly (Table 3, Question IIIC). Six respondents made specific comments about the seminars. They thought that they could have been improved if they had been more structured or focused on the topics (Table 6, Question IIIC). Of the twenty-seven respondents who suggested topics for future conferences (Table 5, Question IIIA), thirteen recommended either National data needs or National data uses or both. A few of the responses indicated a need to know more about NCES data collection activities, how to gain access to NCES data, and how to use the data in their own institutions or agencies.

B. Materials

The respondents were least satisfied with the handout materials. Eighteen percent rated them "poor" (Table 3). Eleven people noted that they had not received them or had received them too late. Thirteen respondents thought that the materials should have included background or position papers related to the seminar topics; seven would have found a list of the Conference participants helpful (Table 6).

C. Participants

Eighty-six percent of the respondents rated the size of the Conference "very good" or "excellent". The mix of participants were rated as highly by sixty percent of the respondents (Table 3). Four respondents thought that there should have been more policy-makers present (Table 6).

D. Administration

Eighty-eight percent of the respondents thought that the Conference was well-administered (Table 3). Almost all of the participants were pleased with the location.

E. Speakers

There was no specific space on the Form for evaluating the speakers. Four respondents, however, commented that the speakers were generalists and that their addresses did not relate to the Conference theme.

F. Recommendations for Future Conferences

On the basis of the responses and comments on the Evaluation Form, future Conferences would be improved by:

1. Including a session on the mission, materials, and services of NCES.
2. Having enough lead time to:
    a. Select carefully the participants and alternates consistent with the purposes and outcomes of the Conference.
    b. Invite a number of participants who are in positions to affect policy decisions in their institutions, agencies or organizations.
    c. Prepare position or background papers well in advance so that the conferees have a chance to read and react to them.

d. Invite at least one speaker who will directly address the issues of the Conference.

e. Provide more opportunities for participants to mix socially in order to exchange ideas and information.

f. Plan the approach - seminar, workshop, task-oriented meetings - in concert with the purposes and anticipated outcomes of the Conference.

II. Use of Data

A. Most Frequently Used NCES Data

Conferees were asked to indicate the frequency with which they use NCES data (Table 7, Question IIA). Data most frequently used were the Colleges and Universities Education Directory, enrollment and financial data. The poor showings of several of the surveys may have been affected by the limited participation of various subgroups.

B. Use Made of NCES Data

Most of the respondents indicated that the principal purposes for using NCES data were as a reference or for research, either ongoing or for a specific project (Table 8, Question IIB).

C. Unavailable Data

On the item asking respondents to indicate data that they could not find during the past six months, the most frequent responses dealt with costs (institutional and program) and with the flow of students through postsecondary institutions (Table 9, Question IID).

III. Most Current Postsecondary Education Issues

Based on the responses of fifty-three conferees, the rank is:

Most Current Issues	Rank
Financial	1
Outcomes of postsecondary education	2
Access and enrollment	3.5
Other	3.5
Concept of postsecondary education	5
"No growth" of postsecondary education	7
Adult and continuing education	7
Federal and State regulations relative to postsecondary education	7
Lack of credibility in postsecondary education	9

(Table 10, Question IIC)

TABLE 1

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION SEMINARS OF 1976

Question I by Question IIIA
Number of questionnaire respondents in the six seminars, by type of organization or agency represented
N = 59

Organization or Agency	Total	I Looking Toward a Single Survey	II Survey Reduction	III Student Access, Choice & Retention	IV Planning & Coordinating PS Programs at State Level	V Development & Consolidation of Program Asst. to States	VI Issues & Concerns of 1985
Total	N=59	6	15	12	6	7	13
Institutions of Higher Education, including junior colleges	N= 9	1	3	1	2	2	
Professional Association	N=16	1	5	4	2	2	2
State Education Agency	N=13	2	3	3	2	2	1
Executive Branch other than NCES	N=13	2	3	3		1	4
Legislative Branch	N= 2		1				1
Other							
- Private Organization	N= 5						5
- Consultant	N= 1				1		

TABLE 2

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION SEMINARS OF 1976

Question III.A.
Respondents' Evaluation of the Seminars
N = 59

Respondents' Evaluation	Total	I Looking Toward A Single Survey	II Survey Reduction	III Student Access Choice & Retention	IV Planning & Coordinating PS Programs at State Level	V Development & Consolidation of Program Assistance to States	VI Issues & Concerns of 1985
Total	N=59	6	18	13	8	9	14
Were the issues relevant to the topic?							
Yes	N=51	6	15	10	2	7	11
No	N= 1				1		
Often	N= 5			2	2		1
Don't know	N= 2				2		
No answer	N= 2				1		1
Was the discussion constructive?							
Yes	N=48	5	14	9	3	5	12
No	N= 1			1			
Generally	N= 5	1		1	1	2	
Don't know	N= 2		1		1		
No answer	N= 3			1	1		1
Should topic be repeated in future conferences?							
Yes	N=45	4	13	9	4	5	10
No	N= 7	2	1	3	1		
Don't know	N= 3					2	1
No answer	N= 4		1		1		2

TABLE 3

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION SEMINARS OF 1976

Question III.C.
Evaluation of the Conference
N = 58

Item		Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Conference location	N=58	30	16	7	3	2
Size of conference	N=58	27	23	7	1	
Mix of participants	N=58	14	21	14	8	1
Substance of seminars	N=53	8	17	21	6	1
Seminar approach	N=57	13	28	13	1	2
Conference administration	N=58	16	19	16	6	1
Handout materials	N=54	4	11	21	8	10

TABLE 4

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION SEMINARS OF 1976

Question III.B.
Evaluation of the most and least helpful aspects of the Conference
N = 56

Item	Most Helpful	Least Helpful
The opportunity to know more about NCES activities	32	13
The opportunity to have input into the future activities of NCES	41	4
The opportunity to exchange ideas and information	49	
The opportunity to know more about the activities of the organizations represented at the Conference	27	15
Other: to discuss unique data reporting problems and to make contacts with NCES	1	

TABLE 5

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION SEMINARS OF 1976

Question III.A.
Recommended Topics for Future Conferences
N = 27

Proposed Topic	Number of Responses
National data needs and uses	13
Integrating State and Federal data needs and systems	3
Analytic uses of NCES data	2
Access of NCES data	2
Automated data collection techniques	1
NCES planning and response burden	1
Data as a motivator of constructive change	1
Data as a management tool	1
Continuing education	2
External and non-traditional degree programs	2
Scope of programs in various types of postsecondary education institutions	1
Plight of middle-income family with college-age children	1
Collection of education data from social institutions	1
Relationship among various Federal statistical agencies	1
Reconstruction of revenue to expenditure surveys	1

TABLE 6

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION SEMINARS OF 1976

Question III.C.
Conditions which would have improved the Conference
N = 27

Recommendations for Improvement	Number of Responses
Seminars needed more structure and focus	5
Pre-Conference materials: sent too late or not received	10
should have included background material or position papers for the seminars	13
should have included a list of participants	7
Participants: should have included more policy makers	4
contained too few practitioners	1
contained too few officials from small institutions	1
Speakers did not relate to the specific topic of the Conference	4
Other Comments: wanted to hear more from Mrs. Eldridge	1
overscheduled	1

TABLE 7

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION SEMINARS OF 1976

Question II.A.
Frequency with which questionnaire respondents use NCES data
N = 58

NCES Data		At Least Monthly	Several Times A Year	Twice A Year	Once A Year	Never
Education Directory: Colleges and Universities	N=55	29	18	3	3	2
Postsecondary Occupational	N=41	9	16	4	3	9
HEGIS: Enrollment	N=52	20	16	5	6	5
Degrees Conferred	N=50	9	13	8	9	11
Staff	N=48	9	13	5	7	12
Salary	N=49	8	16	4	8	13
Financial	N=51	11	9	9	11	11
Library	N=49	2	7	5	11	24
Physical Facilities	N=47	2	4	6	17	18
National Longitudinal Study	N=49	9	6	11	12	11
Postsecondary Vocational	N=46	4	9	8	11	13
Adult and Continuing Education	N=44	6	9	5	15	9
Other: Digest	N=1	1				
Projections	N=2	1	1			
Condition of Education	N=1	1				

TABLE 8

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION SEMINARS OF 1976

Question II.B.
Use Which Questionnaire Respondents Make of NCES Data (Based on number of responses)
N = 55

Purposes for Which Respondents Use NCES Data	Number of Respondents Who Use NCES Data
Planning and budgeting purpose for respondent's organization or institution	29
Policy formulation for administrative purposes	31
Policy formulation for legislative purposes	26
Research, either ongoing or for a specific project	44
As a reference	46
Other: Compliance (Civil Rights)	1
Policy for a professional association	1

TABLE 9

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION SEMINARS OF 1976

Question II.D.
Data at the postsecondary education level that were not available within the past 6 months
N = 41

Data That Were Not Available During the Past Six Months	Number of Responses
Costs data	12
Student flow (admissions, retention, transfer, withdrawal, readmission and completion)	12
Student financial aid	4
Family income of enrolled students	3
Proprietary schools	3
Adult and continuing education	3
Other	15

Data at the Postsecondary Education Level
That were not available within the past 6 months

Cost data

- Comparable data re state expenditures and effort
- Data on which factors affecting the financial health of private institutions are within the institutions' control
- Program costs
- Cost data
- Private industry financial support for employee education (tuition aid, specifically)
- What portion of the annual expenditure for education is for science and engineering?
- Current data on tuition and student charges
- Salary data
- Comparable salary data for all categories of staff
- Final data on faculty salaries in 1974-75 by institution
- Data correlations, for example, expenditures per student for library materials, expenditure per faculty member for library materials
- Graduate cost data for library use

Student flow

- Data which would confirm a variety of inputs showing there appears to be a drastic change occurring in the pattern of attendance at different types of postsecondary institutions
- How long are people taking to complete their studies (particularly important in 2-year colleges)
- Applicant flow data by race
- Earned degrees by race
- Students not returning by race/sex
- Reasons for non-retention
- Current high school graduate data and student migration data that can be broken down to the State level
- Current data on flows of high school graduates by State to institutions
- Retention of students by type of program
- Applications/admissions data
- Student withdrawal-retention
- Where students go to - dropout, stop out, transfer (where to), completions

Student financial aid

- Financial assistance (including State/institutional discretionary assistance) to students
- State student aid programs by type of institution; number of applications and acceptance rate
- Number of part-time BEOG recipients
- The flow of Federal funds among student aid, institutional aid and other during the past ten years

Family income of enrolled students

Good income data re families of enrolled students
Any good information on the "middle-income crunch," real or imaginary
Income levels of enrolled students

Proprietary schools

Most anything about proprietary schools
Proprietary school enrollment data
Size of institutional universe (proprietary).

Adult and continuing education

Number of adults participating and their financial need
State data on enrollments in adult education
Complete data on continuing higher education - credit and non-credit

Other

How many credits are students taking?
Institutional employment/promotion by race
Current minority data by field of study (detailed) for several aggregate levels
Current information on college and university libraries
Specific data about graduate education
Manpower needs
Effectiveness of education in various types of institutions
Data indicating the extent to which students get and hold jobs in the occupational field which they were trained
"Age" distributions of students and faculty
Grade point averages
Up-to-date lists of institutions that are classed as "post-secondary" in their emphasis
Of all institutions eligible for Federal funds under various programs, how many are accredited, how many are in pre-accreditation status, how many are institutionally certified, etc.?
List of certain institutions with total enrollment and tuition information
Ten-year trends of HEGIS data for my state
Clean HEGIS tapes
Institutional data sets, i.e. total sets of institutional analysis (should include student data)

General Comments

Most data are available from one source or another. The difficulty lies in being able to discover or understand the reasons for disparities or incongruities (e.g. changing definitions).

Current (within one year) data re difficult to access.

TABLE 10

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION SEMINARS OF 1976

Question II.C.
Most Current Issue in Postsecondary Education
N = 53

Most Current Issue	Rank	Number of Responses
Financial	1	19
Outcomes of postsecondary education	2	10
Access and enrollment	3.5	7
Concept of postsecondary education	5	4
"No growth" of postsecondary education	7	3
Adult and continuing education	7	3
Federal and State regulations relative to postsecondary education	7	3
Lack of credibility in postsecondary education	9	2
Other	3.5	7

Most Current Issue

Financial:

Financial (no additional comments) 6 responses

Other comments:

- Financing postsecondary education
- Financial stress
- Financial drain
- Fiscal support
- Adequate State funding
- Financial health of private institutions
- Financial problems of institutions
- Who pays for higher education?
- Equalization of funding
- Lack of public support and inadequate financing
- Cost of higher education
- Finances - both student and institutional-in a state of limited resources and inflation
- Resource allocation/efficiency/budget squeeze
- Who shall attend and who shall pay the bill?
- The status of black graduate schools - 30 schools - enrollment and financial data not readily available - their future

Outcomes - Comments

- Identification and assessment of outcome measures
- Meeting consumer interests of potential students at higher education institutions (market mechanisms)
- Identifying the needs of the whole consumer community and adapting postsecondary education to those needs
- Relevance to manpower needs
- The influence of demographic changes in the institutions and the demand for postsecondary education
- The crisis of purposes (for whom and to achieve what/whose goals?)
- Lack of understanding of the purposes of the university (college) - this undergirds financial and other problems
- Value of postsecondary education to individual and society
- Education and employment

"No growth" - Comments

- How institutions will adjust to no-growth
- Institutional adjustments to shrinkage

Most current issue - 2

Access and enrollment - Comments
- Affirmative action and Title IX especially
- Assuring appropriate opportunity for all who need and want it regardless of age, race, sex, ethnicity, and economic circumstances
- Equal opportunity
- Access and the impact of financial aid programs on outcomes and accountability
- Changing patterns of enrollment, i.e. is headcount enrollment increasing faster than FTE enrollment and their effect on course offerings.
- Student access to postsecondary education and the articulation of goals
- Who shall attend and who shall pay the bill?

Federal and State regulations - Comments
- Federal government "rule by regulation" direct or indirect of postsecondary education institutions
- The emergence of the Federal government as the "controller" of postsecondary education with its growing network of regulations

Concept of postsecondary education - Comments
- Understanding of the magnitude of "postsecondary" education in the U.S. or it's specific distribution in states
- Involvement of noncollegiate sector with traditional higher education, and the resulting coordination of planning efforts
- The single concept of collegiate and noncollegiate education; the impossibility of combining data collection terms, instruments, etc.

Other - Comments
- Problems of performance in postsecondary education
- Adaptation to non-traditional methods, methods which emphasize self-learning initiative and responsibility with appropriately vigorous standards
- Institutional eligibility (and accreditation)
- Requirements of the Privacy Act
- Rapidity and degreee of current and oncoming changes
- Need to plan for uncertain futures
- Making the term "postsecondary education" a reality by identifying, gathering data, and shaping policy with regard to all segments of postsecondary education

APPENDIX D

DESCRIPTION OF HEGIS AND OTHER POSTSECONDARY SURVEYS

Plans for the content of each annual HEGIS are made within NCES on the basis of needs expressed by: Congress; the Education Division of HEW; the Federal Interagency Committee on Education (FICE), as well as individual Federal agencies; and the total higher education community. Representatives of institutions of higher education, State Boards, educational associations, Federal agencies and other agencies of regional and national scope attend the annual HEGIS invitational conference to articulate their data needs. Final coordination is effected with FICE and with Education Division program administrators whose programs utilize HEGIS data.

Purpose

Status and trends in the condition of higher education are surveyed periodically and reported for planning and management purposes, institutional research planning, and specific programmatic needs on the basis of the network of coordination described above. The HEGIS system as a whole provides a national data bank constituting the basic time series of data required for policy-relevant understanding of the progress and needs of higher education in the United States.

Data will be collected in Fiscal Year 1976 for the surveys described below in the following areas: institutions, students, employees, finance, libraries, and adult/continuing education. (There will be no survey of institutional physical facilities in FY 1976.) For each survey listed, the point in time or the period of time covered by the data is specified in the survey title.

The trend data provided by the surveys are useful to: institutions for comparisons with peer institutions as an aid in planning; professional associations for analyzing trends in their areas of interest; the States in connection with their policy development and program budgeting; and the Congress and the Federal agencies for planning and implementing national policy in higher education.

Survey data are aggregated by type and control of institution, in summary and by State; individual institutional data for selected items are also provided. Data are disseminated in the form of computer tapes, special tabulations, and printed publications. In addition to NCES publications on individual surveys, selected data are also used and summarized annually by NCES in two annual publications, the Digest of Educational Statistics and the Projections of Educational Statistics, as well as in special-purpose publications.

Institutions

Institutional Characteristics of Colleges and Universities 1976-77. (Annual) This mandated survey acquires from each institution those data necessary to establish the programs. Eligible institutions are listed in the Education Directory--Higher Education together with basic data on location, fees, highest level of offering, accreditation, and principal administrative and academic officers. The data update to the Survey Control File which establishes the higher education universe for all surveys of higher education conducted by the Education Division. In addition to the Directory, two other publications from the survey are of particular interest: Index of Higher Education by State and Congressional District and Basic Student Charges, which present trends, analysis, and Institutional data on typical charges to students.

Students

Opening Fall Enrollment in Higher Education, 1976. (Annual) This survey acquires the numbers enrolled in the fall term by level of student, full- or part-time attendance status, sex, and full-time-equivalent. The 1976 survey includes, for the first time, data on "normal full-time credit-hour load" and total credit-hours for which students are enrolled. There is an early release (December) of selected totals which precedes the full publication.

Degrees and Other Formal Awards Conferred Between July 1, 1975 and June 30, 1976. (Annual) Data by field of specialization and sex of students are acquired for subbaccalaureate, baccalaureate, professional, and advanced degrees. Currently the detail is provided at the subbaccalaureate level on completions of organized occupational curriculums of less than four years designed to prepare students for immediate employment. The primary overall utility of the data is in examining manpower turnout in terms of manpower needs in each field of specialization.

Upper Division and Post-baccalaureate Enrollment by Degree Field, Fall 1976. (May be annual or biennial) For the first time since 1967 data are being obtained on major fields of study for undergraduates at the junior and senior levels. Combined in the same survey instrument is the former annual survey of Students Enrolled for Advanced Degrees. All enrollments are classified by major field, full- or part-time attendance status, and sex. Students enrolled for advanced degrees are classified in two additional categories: students in the first year of required graduate study, and students beyond the first year. As in the degrees survey, the data are needed for manpower planning.

Employees

Salaries, Tenure, and Fringe Benefits of Full-Time Instructional Faculty, 1976-77. This survey is an abbreviated one, acquiring only the annual core-data of mean salaries of instruction/research staff by instructional title, appointment term (9-10 months and 11-12 months), and sex; data on tenure by instructional title and sex; and data on fringe benefits by instructional title. (Included in other years, but not regularly scheduled, are various types of data on numbers and characteristics of instructional faculty and other administrative/research personnel, and limited data on other employees in institutions of higher education.) Because of the intense interest in instructional salaries, an early release is planned for January 1976, preceding the full publication.

Finance

Financial Statistics of Institutions of Higher Education for Fiscal Year Ending 1976. (Annual) This survey acquires data annually on: current funds revenues and expenditures; assets and indebtedness on physical plant; value of endowment; and additional data required by the Bureau of the Census from publicly controlled institutions (formerly surveyed separately by Census). Data categories are consistent with the NCES Higher Education Finance Manual, published in 1975. An early release of selected items is planned for March 1977, preceding full publication of the data.

Libraries

College and University Libraries, Fall 1976. (Annual) This survey acquires data annually on library staff, salaries, fringe benefits, expenditures, holdings, loan transactions, physical facilities, hours open per week, membership in networks and consortia, and use of classification systems. The data will be published in two reports: (1) an institutional listing; (2) an analytic report. This survey has been a part of the HEGIS system since its inception. It will continue in this mode, but also will be a part of the Library General Information Survey (LIBGIS) system (i.e. where applicable it will use the same terms, definitions, and codes as the other LIBGIS surveys.

Adult/Continuing Education

This sample survey of Noncredit Adult/Continuing Education activities sponsored by institutions of higher education in 1975-76 will produce national estimates of the registration and characteristics of these activities by level and control of institutions. A publication will (1) analyze registration data by subject area and occupational specialty; (2) present information on the mechanisms used for instruction (class, workshop, etc.) and the use of educational technology in the delivery systems; (3) elaborate on selected services available to students and/or members of the community; and (4) relate administrative and/or academic unit(s) sponsoring these activities. This periodic survey is conducted at regular intervals.

Methodology

The Higher Education General Information Survey forms are distributed to all institutions of higher education listed in the Education Directory--Higher Education, compiled and published by NCES. In 35 States (including the District of Columbia), the HEGIS is also the State's own survey instrument and is distributed to the institutions through, or in cooperation with, a State higher education agency. In most of the 35 States, the total data acquisition responsibility is also exercised by the State agency; in a few of the 35 States, the data acquisition is a joint Federal-State process. In the other States, and in the outlying parts of the United States, the survey forms are mailed directly to the institutions, and returned by them directly to NCES.

The response rate for all portions of HEGIS, except those dealing with employees and finance, is virtually 100 percent; for employees and finance, the response rate typically exceeds 95 percent. All data received by NCES are edited to determine that they are internally and historically consistent; editing questions are referred to the respondents for solution.

Related Work

HEGIS is strengthened by the long-term NCES effort to produce a general purpose manual in each area reflecting the "state-of-the-art" and providing rationale, systems and definitions relating to the acquisition and organization of data in terms of utility at institutional and governmental levels. The systems are designed for compatability with one another so that data may be interrelated across areas. Manuals are now available in the finance, facilities, and employees areas, and are updated as necessary. Efforts toward a much needed comprehensive manual in the student area are ongoing. As CCD moves from its planning and development stages into its implementation and production states, it will make an increasing contribution. In addition the Taxonomy of Instructional Programs in Higher Education, published by NCES in 1970 has provided a base for data in any survey that is related to academic curriculums, and is used regularly in the student surveys of degrees conferred and of upper division and post-baccalaureate enrollment. As the manuals become more familiar, and as data management systems become more sophisticated at institutional and State levels, the Department will have a potential national data base much more flexible than now to provide additional information that may be required by the Department or by Congress in special or recurring surveys needed to identify and respond to changing needs for higher education policies and programs.